

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. LV, 4

WHOLE No. 220

THE SPANISH WAR OF AUGUSTUS (26-25 B. C.)

I. INTRODUCTION.

It is in no way surprising that the Spanish War of Augustus should have commanded so little attention in modern times; and it might well be asked how far such a subject can repay study. In comparison with the wars in Germany and Illyricum, with the momentous vicissitudes of the frontier policy of Augustus, the subjugation of Northwestern Spain seems dull and tedious. Moreover it is singularly lacking in what is called human interest. The imperial princes, Drusus, Tiberius, and Germanicus, are vivid figures; the characters of Lollius and Varus influenced the course of history. But the generals of Augustus in Spain, Antistius and Carisius, are shadowy and bloodless. On the other side, save for the brigand Corocotta,¹ the heroes of the last struggle for Spanish independence are not even names; and who is Corocotta that he should be set beside Arminius, Maroboduus, or Bato the Dalmatian?

Even the military historian, who so often can win his profit from barren fields like Octavian's campaigns in Illyricum, is here at a loss. The sources baffle enquiry. Cassius Dio, who compresses into one year the campaigns of two, becomes vague as well as brief. Florus and Orosius, however (who had reasons for being interested in Spain), both draw upon a common source, an Epitome of Livy, and provide accounts in which a certain abundance of detail unusual to them is blended with the confusion and obscurity which they have a right to call their own.

¹ Casually introduced by Cassius Dio, 56, 43, 3.

Moreover, even if the truth could be wrested from the sources, the result, so it might appear, would be of little value save for the study of warfare and topography. None the less it can be maintained that the campaigns of 26 and 25 B. C. have a wider significance than this. Though only a part, they are at the same time the best-known and the most important part of that long process of subjugation in Spain which was only completed in 19 B. C.; and this was one of the most difficult and one of the most valuable achievements of the Principate of Augustus, as historians indeed recognised.² The Spanish wars are not merely the suppression of revolts or the reduction of petty tribes that hitherto could be safely neglected. Their purpose and their result was the conquest of a huge area of territory extending from the northern bounds of Portugal to the Pyrenees and comprising some of the most difficult country and most ferocious peoples of Europe. The Callaeci on the western coast had already, it is true, felt the arms of Rome. But the mountain tribes, the Asturians and Cantabrians, were triumphantly independent. No Roman army had ever penetrated their fastnesses. Indeed in recent years the Cantabrians had harried the peaceful tribes of the plateau, the Vaccaei, Autrigones, and Turmogidi, and had extended their dominion over them. Since the Romans had first set foot upon the Iberian peninsula, two hundred years had elapsed. It was high time for the conquest to be completed.

That the Princeps should have chosen to leave Rome in 27 B. C. and betake himself to the provinces which a grateful Senate and People had committed to his charge is easily to be understood: not less so that Spain should first have received his attention. The departure of Augustus was accompanied by a vain rumour of an intended invasion of Britain;³ but, after a brief sojourn in Gaul he arrived in Spain before the end of the year and assumed his eighth consulate at Tarraco on the ensuing January 1st. The hardships of Spanish warfare offered a prospect not so much of military glory as of political credit,

² Cf. especially Livy XXVIII, 12: *itaque ergo prima Romanis inita provinciarum, quae quidem continentis sint, postruma omnium nostra demum aetate ductu auspicioque Augusti Caesaris perdomita est.*

³ Dio 53, 22, 5; 25, 2; and poetry of the period. Dio asserts that Augustus was diverted from the invasion of Britain by risings of the Salassi in the Alps and of the Cantabri and Astures. But it is difficult to believe that Spain was not his original and only goal.

and the conquest of the Northwest would establish the peace and guarantee the prosperity of the whole peninsula. Moreover it would liberate for service elsewhere some at least of the half-dozen legions now in Spain.⁴ Seen in the light of after events, the pacification of Spain was a necessary prelude to that grandiose design of conquest in Central Europe and the Balkans which first becomes definite, but which was perhaps not first designed, in the years 16-13 B. C.

To the study of the two campaigns that were conducted when Augustus was in Spain, few modern scholars have devoted time or trouble. "Schiller repeated the meager narrative of the sources, merely adding a few modern place-names, without subjecting the narrative to criticism, or applying to the vague statements of the ancients the evidence afforded by modern topographical study. Still less satisfactory is the treatment which the war received from Gardthausen and von Domaszewski. Except for Gardthausen's enumeration of the legions composing the army and his attempt to correct an error of the sources in regard to the legates charged with the conduct of a particular campaign, these historians contented themselves with a paraphrase of the sources and omitted entirely any discussion of the topographical problems." Such is the reasoned judgment of Professor Magie, who has made the first and only attempt to discuss the sources and wrest from them something like a coherent historical narrative.⁵ Florus (II, 33) and Orosius (VI, 21, 1-11), the kindred sources, both preserve the same order of events. These he prints side by side and uses the one to control or correct the other. His reconstruction of the war is, in brief, as follows:

1) In 26 B. C. Augustus made ready for the conquest of Northwestern Spain by establishing a base at Segisama or Segisamo (the modern Sasamon, west of Burgos).⁶ From this

⁴ The opinion of Ferrero that Augustus not only wished but needed to lay hands on the gold and silver of Northwestern Spain is not deserving of serious consideration. This region would have been conquered even if it had been as barren of mineral wealth as the Raetian Alps or the haunts of the brigands of the Taurus.

⁵ David Magie, "Augustus' War in Spain (26-25 B. C.)," *Classical Philology* XV (1920), 323-339.

⁶ These two towns are separate and can be distinguished (cf. Magie, *op. cit.*, pp. 328-9), but are not far distant.

position the whole army of Spain moved forward in three columns. One of the columns marched northward, presumably along the river Pisoraca (Pisuerga), and defeated an army of Cantabrians at Vellica, in the southern foothills of the Cantabrian mountains.⁷ They took refuge on the Mons Vindius,⁸ the western portion of the range, and were starved out. The second column moved towards the northeast and captured Aracelum (Aracelum, Florus; Racilium, Orosius) which lies twenty-four miles west of Pompaelo (Pamplona) on the main road from Aquitania.⁹ The third column, however, marched westwards from Segisama across the plateau of León and invaded the mountainous land of the Asturians, finally beleaguering the Mons Medullius, which Orosius designates as *Minio flumini imminentem* (VI, 21, 7). "It was finally captured in the course of the winter, and Augustus, upon receipt of the news, set out from Tarraco to receive the surrender in person."

2) In 25 B. C. the Astures (nothing daunted by the successful campaign of the third division of the Roman army) assembled in three bodies on the river Astura, intending to fall upon three Roman camps.¹⁰ "It would seem that the headquarters of the Romans had been transferred from Segisama to the plain of León, perhaps for the reason that the Cantabri were regarded as conquered and the Astures were now considered the only formidable enemies. Each Roman camp was under the command of a legate. One of these was evidently Carisius, the others were probably Antistius and Furnius (or Firmus)." The design of the Asturians was betrayed to Carisius, who inflicted a crushing defeat upon the enemy. They took refuge in Lancia (Cerro de Lance), nine miles southeast of León.¹¹ Lancia yielded to Carisius, and "the capitulation of this town, according to Dio, was followed by the capture of other strongholds, and the conquest of the district was thus completed."

⁷ Florus has *sub moenibus Bergidae*, in some MSS., however, *Belgicae*. Magie reads *Vellicae*—for *Vellica* is mentioned by Ptolemy (II, 6, 50) as a town of the Cantabri. The reading in Orosius, *Atticae*, is an easily made error for *Vellicae*. Magie's conjecture, in any case highly attractive, has since been proved to be certain (see below, p. 297).

⁸ The *Ὀψος Οὐίνδιον* of Ptolemy II, 6, 20.

⁹ In this identification, however, Magie is probably wrong (see below, p. 297 and p. 310).

¹⁰ Florus II, 33, 54 ff.; Orosius VI, 21, 9-10.

¹¹ *It. Ant.* 395.

Professor Magie's reconstruction has cleared up a number of difficulties, especially those of topography; and the present writer must confess a deep indebtedness to it. None the less, many problems still remain to be indicated, if not to be solved, before a satisfactory account of the war can be provided.¹² In one respect we can now be nearer certainty. A Spanish itinerary has been discovered which records the stations on the important Roman road from the valley of the Pisuerga northwards across the Cantabrian mountains by way of Reinosa to the sea at Santander.¹³ This was the route which, according to Magie, the first of the three columns followed in 26 B. C. One of the stations is named Villecia (the modern Helechía), which confirms his hypothesis about Vellica, and about the route followed by the one column. The itinerary reveals, however, another station, Aracillum (near Reinosa), which suggests that Magie is wrong in identifying the Racilium of Orosius and the Aracelium of Florus with a place far distant, on another road, Aracelium twenty-four miles west of Pompaelo.¹⁴ His proposed route for the second column must therefore be doubted.

But there are more important questions than those of topography that demand a renewed investigation. There appears to be uncertainty about the number of armies in Spain at this time—a question of cardinal importance not only for the strategy of the war but also for the divisions of the Spanish provinces—and uncertainty about the identity and the status of the generals. Moreover, enquiry reveals that the whole order of events in Florus and Orosius is disturbed and confused. It will be convenient to discuss these topics separately and successively.

¹² Rice Holmes, *The Architect of the Roman Empire* II (1931), pp. 7-8, follows the account of Magie but adds in a footnote "I have no criticism to make, except that, owing to textual uncertainties in Florus and Orosius and blunders in the former, the result is necessarily unsatisfactory. Magie, indeed, wisely forbears to attempt to describe the campaign of 25 B. C."

¹³ *L'Année épigraphique* 1921, n. 6, "[Via] L(egione) VII Gemina ad Portu(m) Bledium, Rha[ni]a VII milias, Amaia XVIII, Villecia V, Legio I[V] V, O[c]taviola V, Iuliobriga X, Aracillum V, Portus Bled[ius]]" For topographical identifications, see A. Blásquez, "Cuatro téseras miliarias," *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia* LXXVII (1920), 99-107; M. Besnier, "Itinéraires épigraphiques d'Espagne," *Bull. Hisp.* XXVI (1924), 1-26.

¹⁴ See further below, p. 310. The true form is probably Aracilium.

II. THE NUMBER AND SIZE OF THE SPANISH ARMIES.

When we are first in a position to obtain definite information, that is to say after A. D. 9, the garrison of Spain consists of one army, that of Hispania Citerior (Tarraconensis), numbering three legions, namely, IV *Macedonica*, VI *Victrix*, and X *Gemina*. But at an earlier date, during the conquest of the Northwest in 27-19 B. C., there appear to have been no fewer than six or seven legions in Spain.¹⁵ Besides the three which remained as the garrison in the time of Tiberius, three others are attested by inscriptions and by the coins of colonies in which their veterans were settled after the wars, namely I (*Augusta*?), II *Augusta*, and V *Alaudae*.¹⁶ Moreover, the cognomen of another legion, IX *Hispana*, makes it highly probable that that legion had been stationed in Spain for some years before it proceeded to Illyricum, the province in which its presence is earliest attested.¹⁷ Of these seven legions perhaps only six were in Spain at the same time. One of them may have been summoned from another province, either to provide reinforcements in the period 27-19 B. C.—for these campaigns were tedious and bloody, as we might easily assume even if it were not so definitely stated in the ancient evidence¹⁸—or else a year or two later to take the place of legions probably despatched to the Rhine and to Illyricum in 19-13 B. C. (I, V, and IX?). And it might be conjectured that a legion had come from Africa, the pacification of which province

¹⁵ For the detailed evidence, see U. P. Boissvain, *De re militari Hispaniarum provinciarum aetate imperatoria*, 1879; E. Ritterling, *De legione Romanorum X Gemina*, 1885, and P-W, s. v. *Legio*, cols. 1221-3.

¹⁶ *Legio* I is perhaps the legion which Agrippa punished in 19 B. C. by depriving it of the cognomen *Augusta* (Dio 54, 11, 5). II *Augusta* presumably went to the Rhine in A. D. 9 (E. Ritterling, P-W, s. v. *Legio*, col. 1458). V *Alaudae* probably departed from Spain to Gaul very soon, for it is surely the Fifth Legion which lost its eagle in the 'disaster of Lollius' in 17 or 16 B. C. (Velleius II, 97, 1). Ritterling, however, supposed that the legion which lost its eagle (and was disbanded) was V *Gallica*, and that V *Alaudae* remained in Spain until A. D. 9 (P-W, s. v. *Legio*, cols. 1225 and 1571-2). On legions I and V, see further *JRS* XXIII (1933), 15-19.

¹⁷ P-W, s. v. *Legio*, col. 1665. Ritterling supposes that it had come to Illyricum by 13 B. C.

¹⁸ Dio 54, 11, 5 (19 B. C.).

seems to have been carried a long way forward by the campaigns of Sempronius Atratinus and Cornelius Balbus in 22-19 B. C.¹⁹

Six legions—for there were probably as many as six in Spain at the one time—is too large a total for one provincial army: and indeed the probability that there were still two armies, those of Hispania Citerior and Hispania Ulterior, just as before—for the situation was in no way different—is confirmed by the literary sources for the wars of 27-19 B. C. Cassius Dio mentions the commanders of two separate provincial armies in 22 B. C.²⁰ What was the strength of these armies? Probably of three legions each.²¹ Both Florus and Orosius mention a Roman army of three legions which was attacked by the Asturians in 26 or 25 B. C., but was rescued by another general with his army²² (see further below, p. 303 ff.). Moreover, after the conquest Cantabria was assigned to Hispania Citerior, the extreme northwest, however, Asturia and Callaecia, at first to Ulterior. Subsequently, at some date within a generation of the conquest, Asturia-Callaecia was attached to Hispania Citerior and the Spanish armies were automatically reduced from two to one. Yet even so, when, from A. D. 9 to A. D. 43, there were three legions in this army (IV, VI, X), two of them under the charge of one legate were stationed in Asturia-Callaecia, while another legate with one legion kept watch over the Cantabrians, as we learn from the circumstantial account of Strabo.²³ If this distribution of the armed forces in Spain was advisable after the subjugation of the Northwest, how much more necessary was the presence of the two armies before it. Yet their existence is seldom, if ever, allowed for in modern accounts of the campaigns of 26 and 25 B. C., not even by Gardthausen (who admits the presence of six legions) or by Professor Magie. It is of cardinal importance for the elucidation of the war: and even if not adequately attested by the evidence referred to above, would be imperiously demanded by the known geographical conditions,

¹⁹ For the view that there may have been more legions than one in Africa in the time of Augustus, cf. *JRS* XXIII (1933), 24-5.

²⁰ Dio 54, 5, 1.

²¹ Kornemann ("Die Entstehung der Provinz Lusitanien," *Festschrift für Hirschfeld*) admits a total of six legions, two in Hispania Citerior, four in Ulterior—probably on the analogy of the distribution of the three legions of Spain in the period A. D. 9-43.

²² Florus II, 33, 54; Orosius VI, 21, 9.

²³ Strabo III, p. 166.

especially by the absence of easy communications between Portugal and Northern Spain—the essential factor of the strategy of the Peninsular War. For this reason it would be permissible to conjecture that, though the Cantabrians could be dealt with by the army of Hispania Citerior alone, the penetration and subjugation of Asturia could only be effected by the two armies, the one coming from the east, the other from the south.

The vexed problems of the divisions of the Spanish provinces are here of relevance only in so far as they concern the armies. Cassius Dio mentions Baetica among the provinces assigned to the Senate in 27 B. C. Many scholars have doubted whether Hispania Ulterior was divided into imperial Lusitania and senatorial Baetica at so early a date. Albertini, however, in his full examination of the whole question, comes to the conclusion that Dio is right.²⁴ Yet the division of a province might have been expected to follow rather than precede an increase in its area: and the present writer is of the opinion that Augustus in 27 B. C. took as his portion all Spain just as he took all Gaul, and only gave Baetica (like Narbonensis) to the Senate and People when the work of pacification and organisation was well on the way to completion. The date of this change is an entertaining subject for speculation, but here only relevant to the nomenclature of the commander of the second Spanish army in the early years of the Principate—legate of all Hispania Ulterior, or legate of Lusitania. Merely for the purposes of brevity and convenience the two armies will be referred to as those of Tarraconensis and Lusitania respectively in the course of the following investigations. Nor need it concern the present enquiry to determine the date at which Asturia-Callaecia was detached from Lusitania and joined to Tarraconensis. This was clearly the result of a reduction of the total of legions in Spain, which rendered advisable the fusion of the two armies into one. Albertini suggests that this happened in the years 7-2 B. C.²⁵ An attractive date would be A. D. 9, in which year the garrison was in fact reduced to three legions, from a total of five, as Ritterling held, or rather, perhaps, in the opinion of the present writer,

²⁴ E. Albertini, *Les divisions administratives de l'Espagne romaine*, 1923, pp. 25-41.

²⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 34-5.

from a total of four.²⁶ But the change may have taken place before this date.²⁷

However that may be, a recognition of the existence of the two Spanish armies makes it possible to distinguish the generals employed in the Spanish campaigns, their status and their functions.

III. THE LEGATES OF AUGUSTUS IN SPAIN.

In this matter the account of Florus has introduced error and confusion. When summing up the narrative of the campaigns of 26 and 25 B. C. after the fall of the Mons Medullius he employs the words: *haec per Antistium Furniumque legatos et Agrippam hibernans in Tarraconis maritimis Caesar accepit* (II, 33, 51). Gardthausen perceived that Florus is grossly in error.²⁸ Augustus left Spain in 24 B. C. In 25 B. C. Agrippa was certainly in Rome; he did not go to Spain until 19 B. C. Moreover, a passage in Dio dates Furnius to 22 B. C. — "the Cantabri," he says, "despised him because he had but recently arrived and they reckoned that he had no experience of Cantabria."²⁹ This seems pretty definite. Florus is wrong — these three generals were not simultaneously in Spain in the years 26-5 B. C. Antistius and Furnius were successively in Spain, or rather in Tarraconensis, in the period 26-22 B. C.: and Agrippa had charge of Spain, in virtue of his imperium, in 19 B. C.

Magie, however, does not accept this explanation in its entirety. Instead of Furnius the manuscripts of Florus give Firmius, those of Orosius, Firmus. Magie therefore prefers to suppose that there was an otherwise unknown Firmus or Firmius in Spain in 26-5 B. C., at the same time as Antistius. But he cannot escape the fact that Florus is wrong about Agrippa: and his argument that Furnius would still in any case be a new-comer to the Cantabri in 22 B. C. because the operations of Furnius

²⁶ P-W, s. v. *Legio*, col. 1237. Cf., however, *JRS* XXIII (1933), 19 and 29.

²⁷ In the year 3-2 B. C. the presence of the distinguished consular and friend of Augustus, Paullus Fabius Maximus, is attested in Callaecia (Dessau, *ILS* 8895): but it is not known whether he was legate of Tarraconensis or legate of Lusitania.

²⁸ *Augustus u. seine Zeit* II, 2, p. 374.

²⁹ Dio 54, 5, 1.

mentioned by Florus were directed not against the Cantabri but against the Astures, is not a strong one, for these operations, on his own showing, were conducted by troops from Tarraconensis, not from Lusitania. He could not make Furnius the governor of Lusitania in 26-5 B. C., for the governor of Lusitania is surely Carisius. It is he who rescues the other Roman army, overwhelms the Astures and takes Lancia, it is he who founds Emerita in the same year—and is still governor in 22 B. C.³⁰ In Magie's view Carisius, Antistius, and Furnius are merely the legionary legates in charge of the three camps attacked by the Astures. This can hardly be. In one of the sources Carisius is clearly designated as the commander of another army, which comes to the rescue and forestalls the Asturians.³¹ Moreover we know that Antistius (Vetus) was of consular standing. A simple solution offers itself: Antistius is the legate of Tarraconensis in 26-5 B. C., Furnius in 22 B. C., Carisius is in charge of Lusitania and its army from 26 to 22 B. C. (see further the Appendix, p. 315).

IV. THE ORDER OF EVENTS IN 26 AND 25 B. C.

The order of events is consistent from first to last in Florus and Orosius. But it is very difficult to distinguish the campaigns of the two years. Florus is hopelessly confused—in his precipitate epitomizing he connects the fall of Aracillum, the last event of the Cantabrian War, with the siege of the Mons Medullius (II, 33, 50): and the Mons Medullius, wherever it may be, is somewhere in Asturia-Callaecia, at the very least nearly two hundred miles away. Orosius, however, is more helpful. After recounting the Cantabrian War (the battle of Vellica, the surrender on the Mons Vindius, the fall of Aracillum), he continues with the words: *praeterea ulteriores Gallaeciae partes, quae montibus silvisque consitae Oceano terminantur, Antistius et Furnius legati magnis gravibusque bellis perdomuerunt. Nam et Medullium montem Minio flumini imminentem in quo se magna multitudo hominum tuebatur, per XV milia passuum fossa circumsaepit obsidione cinxerunt* (VI, 21, 3). This point

³⁰ Florus II, 33, 54-8; Orosius VI, 21, 9-10; Dio 53, 25, 8; 54, 5, 1-3. Coins of Carisius, Babelon I, pp. 318 ff.

³¹ Florus II, 33, 56: *a quibus praemonitus Carisius cum exercitu advenit.*

surely provides the break between the operations of the two years. Those of the first year were devoted to the subjugation of Cantabria—only Cantabria, as the sources themselves indicate.³² They were conducted by Augustus in person. Here then we have a fixed point, the *Bellum Cantabricum* of 26 B. C. What follows next in Orosius, the invasion of the further parts of Callaecia and the siege of the Mons Medullius, was achieved by Antistius (and by the anachronistic Furnius!), the legate of *Tarraconensis* in the absence of Augustus, and therefore does not belong to the first year, 26 B. C., at all, but to the second year.³³ That is to say, the invasion of Asturia-Callaecia was not conducted, as Magie maintains, by one of the three columns of the army which operated in 26 B. C. under the charge, or at least the general supervision, of Augustus himself; it was the work of his legate of *Tarraconensis*, in his absence. This is evident both from the sources and on general grounds. The first year, we are informed by the sources, was devoted to the invasion of Cantabria in three army-columns. What then would one of these have been doing far to the west in Callaecia? The conquest of Asturia-Callaecia was far too arduous a task for merely a third part of the army of *Tarraconensis*—and was, in fact, probably achieved as the result of the operations of both armies (see below, p. 310). Augustus did not like taking risks in war.³⁴

The invasion of Asturia-Callaecia, then, belongs and must belong to the year 25 B. C. How does Carisius' defeat of the Astures and capture of Lancia in the same year (attested inde-

³² Florus II, 33, 48: *inde tripertito exercitu totam Cantabriam amplexus*; Orosius VI, 21, 3: *tribus agminibus totam paene amplexus Cantabriam*.

³³ According to Orosius (VI, 21, 6-8) the Mons Medullius was captured by Antistius and Furnius. As Furnius did not come to Spain until 22 B. C. (Dio 54, 5, 1) there might be some grounds for supposing that the operation belongs to that year. Cf. W. T. Arnold (*Studies of Roman Imperialism*, p. 157): "I am inclined to think that the siege of the fortress on Mons Medullius should be placed in 22 B. C. The details of the suicide of the Cantabrians by sword, fire, and poison (Dio 54, 5) correspond very closely to the account of the close of that siege in Florus." But Arnold has not observed that the siege described by Florus was in Asturia-Callaecia, not in Cantabria. Moreover he appears (*op. cit.*, p. 155) to be unconsciously identifying the Mons Vindius (in Cantabria) with the Mons Medullius (in Asturia).

³⁴ Suet. *Aug.* 25.

pendently by Dio) fit in with this order of events? In Florus and Orosius the exploits of Carisius are narrated after the conquest of Asturia-Callaecia — indeed, they appear as the last operations of the Spanish wars. This is strange, more than strange. Lancia, τὸ μέγιστον τῶν Ἀστύρων πόλις,³⁵ was situated on the plateau in the vicinity of the city of León, south of the Cantabrian chain and east of the Montañas de León. The neighbourhood is one of no little strategic importance. It is significant that when, from the time of Vespasian onward, the garrison of Spain had been permanently reduced to one legion, that legion was stationed at León, a position from which it would be within striking distance of both Cantabrians and Asturians. It is difficult to believe that Augustus in 26 B. C. could have contemplated a conquest of the Cantabrian mountains to the north with Lancia as yet untaken on his flank. Can Antistius in the next year have penetrated into the heart of Asturia-Callaecia with Lancia lying on the very road which the army of Tarraconensis was to follow in its westward march? No modern writer seems to have felt any qualms about it. But it cannot be believed. It is as though a Roman army coming from north-eastern Italy were to be found operating against Pannonians far down the Save without having bothered about Siscia. We must ask, does the capture of Lancia really follow, instead of preceding, the invasion and conquest of Asturia-Callaecia? The sources themselves almost betray the truth. Florus introduces the exploits of Carisius with the words *Astures per id tempus* (II, 33, 54). In an epitomator, such an expression is often worse than useless, for it may be completely and hopelessly wrong: but, if it were pressed, it should at least mean that the exploits of Carisius took place during the time when some of the operations which he has been describing were still going on, namely the Cantabrian War and the siege of the Mons Medullius (which he conflates). Orosius' treatment of this episode begins with the words *Astures vero* (VI, 21, 9). Why *vero*? It emphasizes by a contrast the word preceding. With whom then are the Astures to be contrasted? With the defenders of the Mons Medullius? But they too are Asturian. The unspoken contrast to *Astures* is certainly *Cantabri*. The cumulative suggestion of *Astures per id tempus* and *Astures vero* is a very powerful

³⁵ Dio 53, 25, 8; cf. Florus II, 33, 57: *validissima civitas*.

one—the exploits of Carisius should be dated either during or just after the *Bellum Cantabricum*, i. e. in 26 B. C. or at the very beginning of 25 B. C. This interpretation demands a detailed justification.

V. THE EPISODE OF CARISIUS.

The exploits of Carisius are intelligible in time and place only on the hypothesis that Florus and Orosius (or their source) have inserted them out of chronological order. A hypothesis of such a kind should be invoked only in the direst need, it is true: an examination of the methods of composition of Florus and Orosius will show how often it is necessary. We have seen how Florus compresses Antistius, Furnius, and Agrippa into the period when Augustus was wintering in Tarraco (II, 33, 51): to approximately the same period Orosius, using the words *quibus etiam diebus*, assigns many anachronistic events (VI, 21, 22). Florus, in another part of his work makes the march of D. Junius Brutus into Callaecia (137 B. C.) precede instead of follow the end of Viriathus (I, 33, 12); and if we had only his account we might imagine that Varus was the immediate successor of Drusus in Germany (II, 30, 31).

Epitomators often err about the order of events. This is especially the case when they are dealing (whether they know it or not) with two or more armies operating separately. Thus Florus and Orosius, after narrating the Cantabrian War, proceed with the further operations of the army of *Tarraconensis* under Antistius and only introduce Carisius with the army of Lusitania at the very end, as an afterthought, and in the wrong place. For this confusion the epitomator of Livy may have been responsible. But the original himself, hardly one of the better military historians, may have supplied a misleading narrative. One of Livy's chief sources must have been the Autobiography of Augustus—both as a historian and as a personal friend of the Princeps he had no choice. This work closed with the Cantabrian War and went no further—*Cantabrico tenus bello nec ultra*.⁸⁶ What is this *Bellum Cantabricum*? Orosius makes it begin in 28 B. C. and end in 24 B. C., with a duration of five years inclusive (VI, 21, 1 and 21). Properly speaking, however,

⁸⁶ Suet. *Aug.* 85.

the *Bellum Cantabricum* should be only the campaign of 26 B. C. The prominence which Augustus' presence lent to that campaign soon caused the name to be applied to both campaigns, those of 26 and 25 B. C., to the almost complete suppression in historical sources of any mention of the Asturians—against whom, as has been seen, Augustus did not proceed in person.³⁷ Now Augustus, as we know, "did not recount the exploits of others, but only his own":³⁸ naturally enough, for the work was not a history but an autobiography. Therefore it ended when his part of the Spanish wars, the *Bellum Cantabricum*, ended, in 26 B. C.—and not as is usually believed, in 25 B. C.³⁹ So, when Livy related the campaign of 26 B. C., he would have at his disposal the best of sources—and a single source. For the next year this would fail him: for the deeds of Antistius and Carisius he may have had to rely upon separate (and perhaps oral) sources of information and so may have inserted them, if not in the wrong order, at least carelessly, without either himself understanding or making clear to his readers the connection of events. Both Florus and Orosius, as we have seen, narrate the exploits of Carisius at a point which makes them a geographical and a military absurdity. Dio likewise records them at the end of the year 25 B. C. This concurrence of authorities might appear to provide a strong presumption of their veracity. But what if the same error, for error there has certainly been, lies at the root of both accounts? It is not enough to discredit these sources merely on geographical and military grounds, overwhelming though the case is. The case cannot be proved conclusively until the source and explanation of their error has been revealed. A very simple

³⁷ The three statements or anecdotes given by Strabo (III, p. 156; p. 164-6) refer only to the Cantabri. Horace, when referring to the subjugation of Spain, mentions only the Cantabri, never the Astures. Likewise Suetonius, Eutropius, and Aurelius Victor.

³⁸ Appian III. 15: καὶ ὅπως μὲν, οὐκ ἔγνω. οὐ γὰρ ἀλλοτρίας πράξεις ὁ Σεβαστός, ἀλλὰ τὰς ἑαυτοῦ συνέγραψεν.

³⁹ Still less 24 B. C., as Peter, *Die gesch. Litt. über die römische Kaiserzeit* I, p. 372 and Rosenberg, *Einleitung u. Quellenkunde zur römischen Gesch.*, p. 95. Blumenthal ("Die Autobiographie des Augustus," *Wiener Studien* XXXV [1914], 114) says that the closing of the temple of Janus after the war in 25-24 B. C. would be a suitable ending: for a history—but not for a strictly autobiographical memoir (cf. Appian III. 15). For the year 25 B. C. Augustus would have had nothing but his maladies to recount (Dio 53, 25, 7; Suet. *Aug.* 81).

explanation can be brought forward. According to Dio, veterans were dismissed at the close of the campaign of 25 B. C. and the colony of Emerita was founded.⁴⁰ Now Emerita, as we know, was associated with Carisius—his coins bear the name and the image of that colony.⁴¹ It is reasonable to assume that he founded it. This being so, the rest is clear. The ultimate source of Florus, Orosius, and Dio did not recount the exploits of Carisius in their proper place in the war of 26-5 B. C., but brought them in when it mentioned his founding of Emerita in 25 B. C., a fitting occasion for a recapitulation of his services.

There remains, however, a problem which is perhaps insoluble. Do the exploits of Carisius belong to the spring of 26 B. C. or to the spring of 25 B. C.? First of all, the facts. The Asturians evidently sought to forestall the Roman attack. They "descended from their snowy mountains," gathered in three divisions at the river Astura and made ready to fall upon three Roman camps.⁴² If the phrase of Florus, *a montibus niveis*, has any value at all and is not merely ornamental, these three camps are winter-camps—those of the army of Tarraconensis, probably of three legions.⁴³ Where were they? Not necessarily on the Astura itself (which is either the Esla or its tributary, the Orbigo), but perhaps farther to the east. The army of Tarraconensis did not get wind of this design. But the commander of the other army had received early intelligence of it—the Brigaecini (in the neighbourhood of Benavente)⁴⁴ revealed it to him. And so Carisius came up in haste with his army from Lusitania,⁴⁵ and defeated the Astures in battle. He followed up his victory and captured the strong place of Lancia, not far from León. A result of these operations was, it is to be presumed, the subjugation of those Asturians who dwelt on the plateau of León (the Astures Augustani, as they were later called). The more formidable

⁴⁰ Dio 53, 26, 1.

⁴¹ Babelon I, pp. 318 ff.

⁴² Florus II, 33, 54-8; cf. Orosius VI, 21, 9-10.

⁴³ See above, p. 299.

⁴⁴ On the Brigaecini, cf. Magie, *op. cit.*, p. 337. Their town Brigaecium was forty miles southeast of Asturica (*It. Ant.* 439 and 440), and is perhaps Benavente on the river Orbigo. The strategic importance of this place is revealed in the history of the Peninsular War.

⁴⁵ Florus II, 33, 56: *a quibus praemonitus Carisius cum exercitu advenit.*

hill-tribes, however, still remained to be dealt with. On general grounds one would prefer to date these operations to the beginning of the year 26 B. C. Augustus was not likely to proceed against the Cantabrians until all precautions had been taken. When his columns marched northwards towards the Cantabrian mountains, their flank and communications would have been exposed to attack if the Asturians still held Lancia. The operations of Carisius could therefore be regarded as a desirable, if not a necessary, preliminary to the conquest of Cantabria. In this way the western flank of the army of Tarraconensis may have been made secure. Similarly one would be tempted to assume that, before the campaign of 26 B. C., there had been operations to the east, in the Pyrenaean regions, to make available for troops and supplies the best line of communications from Aquitania, by way of Pompaelo and Virovesca to Segisamo.⁴⁶ No fewer than six Spanish triumphs had been celebrated at Rome in the preceding ten years. Such preliminary operations are very often dwarfed by the climax of a war, their actors overshadowed. For example, the triumphant Alpine campaign of the favoured stepsons of Augustus in 15 B. C. has almost crowded out the solid achievement of P. Silius Nerva which made it possible.

It will here be assumed that the capture of Lancia by the legate of Lusitania took place just before the campaign of 26 B. C. If, however, as is quite possible, it belongs to the beginning of 25 B. C., one might suppose that during the campaign of the former year Carisius and a part of his army had moved northwards in order to keep watch on the Asturians while the army of Tarraconensis was engaged in the Cantabrian mountains.

An attempt may now be made to reconstruct the war of 26-5 B. C. It falls sharply apart into two campaigns, the *Bellum Cantabricum*, conducted by Augustus in person, and the *Bellum Asturicum* (as it may conveniently be called, though there is no ancient authority for the name) by the legates in command of the two armies.

⁴⁶ *It. Ant.* 455. For the fact that supplies were brought from Aquitania, cf. Strabo III, p. 165: ἐπεσιτίζοντο δὲ ἐκ τῆς Ἀκνιτανίας χαλεπῶς διὰ τὰς δυσχωρίας. It is unfortunate that the justification of the Spanish triumph of Sex. Appuleius on January 26th, 26 B. C., is not known (*CIL* I², pp. 50, 77, 181). It is to be noted, however, that Orosius makes the Cantabrian War begin in 28 B. C. (VI, 21, 1).

VI. THE BELLUM CANTABRICUM OF 26 B. C.

Augustus was in charge, but Antistius the legate of Tarraconensis was no doubt with him. Antistius already had some experience of mountain warfare.⁴⁷ The army marched forth from its base at Segisamo in three columns. It is not possible to determine with certainty the routes followed by each of them. But the design of conquest was grandiose — it embraced the whole, or almost the whole, of Cantabria: ⁴⁸ and if, as has been suggested above, the plateau of León had already been cleared of hostile Asturians by Carisius, and the Romans already held the main line of communication with Aquitania by way of Pompaelo (Pamplona), a guess can be hazarded. The three most important passes leading across the Cantabrian mountains to the coast are the following: north of León the pass of Pajares, leading to Gijón; that of Reinosa, from the valley of the Pisuerga across to Santander; and that, beyond Espinosa, leading northeasterly to Bilbao. It might be supposed that these were the routes of the three columns. Of the operations of the western and the eastern columns nothing appears to be recorded in our sources. This was to be expected if, as a matter of fact, the central column was that conducted by Augustus himself; as has been shown above, the ultimate source of the detailed information about the whole war was the autobiography of Augustus. Two place-names mentioned in the ancient evidence put the route of this central army beyond dispute. It was that of the later Roman road from the valley of the Pisuerga across the mountains by Reinosa to Santander and the sea. This road was present in none of the itineraries, but was attested by a milestone.⁴⁹ A recent discovery has revealed its course and the names of its stations.⁵⁰ Vellica, where the first battle occurred, can be identified as the modern Helechía, five Spanish miles south of the station of Legio IV.⁵¹

After the battle of Vellica, the Romans moved forward and gained the pass of Reinosa. The Cantabrians were thus split asunder and could be isolated and subdued. Some of them took

⁴⁷ Against the Salassi (Appian *III*. 17).

⁴⁸ Florus II, 33, 48; Orosius VI, 21, 3 (quoted above, p. 303, n. 32).

⁴⁹ *CIL* II, 4883, of A. D. 33-34.

⁵⁰ *L'Année épigraphique* 1921, n. 6, quoted above, p. 297, n. 13.

⁵¹ See above, p. 297. The identification is due to Blásquez.

refuge in the hill-fortress of Aracillum (beyond Reinos) ⁵² and held out there till the end of the campaign. The Romans could now reach the coast. A fleet coöperated, bringing troops, and probably supplies, from Aquitania. ⁵³ And so the task of reducing the enemy could proceed. Many of the Cantabrians had fled, so the sources inform us, to the Mons Vindius (the White Mountain?). This is the name given to the western portion of the Cantabrian range; somewhere upon it one body of Cantabrians was hemmed in and reduced. But we are told only about the operations of one of the three Roman armies — that commanded by Augustus. There must have been many an unrecorded siege, many an act of heroism or ferocity. The Cantabrians were a resolute and a resourceful enemy: and the Romans had to contend with hunger, with burning heat, and with plagues of flies. ⁵⁴ With the fall of the fortress of Aracillum the campaign closed; and Cantabria appeared to have been conquered. Augustus, worn out and dangerously ill, retired to Tarraco. ⁵⁵ He did not take part in the next year's campaign, the invasion of the mountain-girt fastnesses of Asturia. ⁵⁶ How was this effected?

VII. THE BELLUM ASTURICUM OF 25 B. C.

For the reconstruction of this campaign the sources provide no help at all. They mention only one army (that of Tarracensis). Yet the army of Lusitania must have coöperated—

⁵² Aracelium, Florus; Racilium, Orosius. The new itinerary has Aracillum, but the true form is probably Aracilium. It lay five Spanish miles beyond Juliobriga (near Reinos) and is perhaps to be identified with Aradillos, where there are remains of an extensive hill-fortress (cf. Dillon, *Travels through Spain*², 1782, p. 141).

⁵³ Florus II, 33, 49; Orosius VI, 21, 4. For the difficulty of bringing supplies from Aquitania, cf. Strabo III, p. 165 (quoted above, p. 308, n. 46). In P-W, s. v. *Cantabri*, col. 1482, it is stated that the fleet was commanded by Agrippa. This cannot be.

⁵⁴ Dio 53, 25, 5-6. For the flies, cf. Strabo III, p. 165.

⁵⁵ Dio 53, 25, 7. This was one of his most serious illnesses; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 81: *praecipue Cantabria domita*.

⁵⁶ Dio, to be sure, says that Augustus fought against the Cantabrians and Asturians at the same time (53, 25, 5); but he compresses the two campaigns into the one year 25 B. C. — and there is no evidence that Augustus in person fought against the Astures. The scope of the campaign of 26 B. C. is indicated by Florus II, 33, 48; Orosius VI, 21, 3.

what was it there for, if not for this? None of the modern authorities who have dealt with this war has followed the guidance of the dominant and unchanged geographical conditions and assumed that the conquest of Asturia-Callaecia must have been the result of an invasion by two armies operating from separate and distant bases. The sources, to be sure, breathe not a hint of it: but they are not interested in the campaign as such; they mention only its dramatic end, the affair of the Mons Medullius. Even good authorities, however, may omit the march of a separate column, especially if that march is not accompanied by serious fighting. For example, Appian recounts fully and carefully Octavian's march from the Liburnian coast through the land of the Iapudes to Siscia in 35 B. C. But that is neither the best nor the only way of taking troops to Siscia: it is difficult to refrain from conjecturing that another army had marched down from Emona, easily and quickly, through friendly territory, to meet Octavian at or near Siscia. Appian does not mention it: but then his source, the autobiographical memoir of Augustus (which has been referred to above) will have given it scant attention. The advance of separate armies to a common goal was a method well known to the generals of Augustus and often practised. In 15 B. C. the Alps were conquered by armies operating both from Gaul and from Northern Italy. In A. D. 6 Bohemia was to succumb before a double, if not a triple advance, from the Rhine, from the Danube, perhaps from Raetia as well. The last stage of the suppression of the great revolt of the Pannonians and Dalmatians, the *Bellum Dalmaticum* of A. D. 9, witnessed a triple division of the Roman forces.

There would therefore be some reasons for assuming that in a similar situation, the penetration and conquest of Asturia-Callaecia, the two armies of *Tarraconensis* and *Lusitania* were to coöperate, and that there were at least two columns of advance, from the east and from the south. What follows is but guess-work. A large part of the army of *Tarraconensis* no doubt had to stay behind to hold down the Cantabrians and protect the long lines of communication. The rest marched with Antistius westwards, past León, past Astorga, over the *Montañas de León* by the pass of Manzanal into the mountain-girt basin of El Vierzo. In the meantime Carisius set in motion the army of *Lusitania*. Where it marched, and in how many columns, will never be

known. Perhaps up the valley of the Minho, perhaps from Braga to the river Limia and then northeastwards to the Sil, following the line of the later Roman road Bracara-Nemetobriga-Bergidum-Asturica. Thus he would cut off the difficult mountainous region of Orense and southwestern León—that is to say, those parts which lie between the above route and the other road from Braga to Astorga, the road Bracara-Aquae Flaviae-Compleutica-Asturica. From the Callaeci in the coastal region Carisius probably encountered no resistance. The Romans could dispose of a fleet⁵⁷—indeed Julius Caesar had reached Corunna in 61 B. C. Less accessible and less amenable were the Asturians. How much fighting was done, the nature of the sources makes it impossible to say.

The armies of Tarraconensis and of Lusitania, or at least some of their columns, effected a junction and proceeded to invest the Asturian fastness, the Mons Medullius, with a circumvallation fifteen miles in length. Of this site, no plausible identification has yet been offered.⁵⁸ All that is known is that it was *Minio flumini imminens*, somewhere on or near the Minho or its tributary the Sil—for the latter is the more considerable river of the two. According to the sources the fall of this position marked the end of the campaign.

The above remarks are nothing more than speculations about the conquest of Asturia-Callaecia; but they may claim to have the support of geography and of analogy. It would perhaps be most prudent to resign forever all hope of eliciting a credible

⁵⁷ Cf. above, p. 310, n. 53, and Isidorus, *Origines*, 15, 1, 69: *Emeritam Caesar Augustus aedificavit postquam Lusitaniam et quasdam Oceani insulas cepit.*

⁵⁸ Magie (*op. cit.*, pp. 334-5) suggests that it is to be identified with the ridge running from east to west just before the confluence of the Sil and the Cabrera in the southwest of the province of León—and this may be right. Schulten, in the brief notice in P-W, *s. v. Medullius*, says "wohl der Berg S. Julian am Miño bei Tuy, auf dem ich einen ausgedehnten iberischen Ringwall fand." But this would not be a suitable place for the last stand of the Asturians, nor would a circumvallation of fifteen miles (Florus II, 33, 50; Orosius VI, 21, 6-8) have been required. In another article (P-W, *s. v. Hispania*, col. 1984) Schulten says that there are two places called Mons Medullius. It is evident that if a site near the mouth of the river Tuy is to be baptized with the name of Mons Medullius, another Mons Medullius must be sought as the scene of the events described by Florus and Orosius.

and coherent account of a series of military operations from sources like Florus and Orosius. They contain, however, a certain amount of geographical detail, confused though it is. They therefore provide the materials for constructing an account of the route followed by one of the three Roman columns in the *Bellum Cantabricum* of 26 B. C. About the other two columns, however, and about the *Bellum Asturicum* of 25 B. C., details are lacking. All that we know is that Asturia and Callaecia were in fact conquered.

VIII. CONCLUSION.

According to Florus, at some time subsequent to the fall of the Mons Medullius Augustus came in person to the scene, brought down the natives from their mountains, exacted hostages and sold captives into slavery. This visit of Augustus is placed by Magie immediately after the capitulation. But Augustus in 25 B. C. was far too ill to undertake so arduous a journey, and his presence was not imperatively demanded. The confused abbreviation of Florus probably refers to a later date, as an examination of the context suggests.⁵⁹ Augustus was once again in Spain, during the course of his second sojourn in the provinces of the West in 16-13 B. C.⁶⁰ In 16 B. C. there had been some slight disturbances in Spain; and 15 B. C. was a year in which many colonies were established in Gaul and Spain.⁶¹ It may indeed have been at this time that *Hispania Ulterior* was divided into *Lusitania* and *Baetica*.

After the two campaigns of 26 and 25 B. C. Augustus appears to have regarded the war as over, Spain as pacified. Elderly soldiers were paid off and the colony of *Emerita* was founded. Augustus himself returned to Rome in 24 B. C. and a grateful Senate decreed that the temple of Janus should be closed. But the work of subjugation had not been thorough—indeed it had only begun. As in *Illyricum*, comparable by reason of the difficulty of the country and the ferocity of the natives, the first

⁵⁹ II, 33, 51-2: *haec per Antistium Furniumque legatos et Agrippam hibernans in Tarraconis maritimis Caesar accepit. mox ipse praesens hos deduxit montibus, hos obsidibus adstrinxit, hos sub corona iure belli venumdedit.*

⁶⁰ *Res Gestae* 12; cf. Horace, *Odes* IV, 5 and 14.

⁶¹ Dio 54, 20, 3; 23, 7.

submission was largely illusory. The suppression of the great revolt of the Pannonians and Dalmatians (A. D. 6-9) was in every way a more arduous task than had been their conquest some twenty years before. Likewise in Spain—the natives rose again and again. The pacification of the land could only be effected by the weapons of famine and massacre, by driving roads through the hills and by building fortified posts.

The presence of Augustus in the field in the year 26 B. C. has not only had a disturbing effect upon the sources for the campaigns of 26 and 25 B. C. It has warped and deformed the historical perspective of the whole process of the subjugation of Northwestern Spain. The exploits of Augustus in 26 B. C. have overshadowed everything that went before and everything that came after. It has been shown above that, before the arrival of Augustus, certain preliminary operations had probably paved the way for the conquest of Cantabria: and to Orosius 28 B. C. is the first year of the war (VI, 21, 1). But Orosius makes the war terminate in 24 B. C. Likewise Velleius, but with less excuse, for he was closer to the events. Velleius affects to believe that after Augustus' campaign there was no war, not even brigandage, in Spain.⁶² Yet at the time to which he refers there was serious fighting, adequately attested by Cassius Dio, in 24, 22, and 19 B. C.⁶³ Apart from stray references in the chroniclers Jerome and Cassiodorus and in Horace, only Dio has preserved these further campaigns from oblivion. It was only in 19 B. C. when Agrippa was brought to Spain that the pacification of the Northwest was completed—and then only after untold exertions and by the use of wholesale massacre and enslavement. We have every right to speak of a ten years' war in Spain (28-19 B. C. inclusive).

The prospect of a rising in Spain was still, however, a danger that had to be reckoned with. Even after the disaster of Varus Spain retained three legions. A war in Asturia is attested in the time of Nero;⁶⁴ and though the garrison had been reduced

⁶² Velleius II, 90, 4: *has igitur provincias tam diffusas, tam frequentes, tam feras ad eam pacem abhinc annos ferme quinquaginta perduxit Caesar Augustus, ut quae maximis bellis nunquam vacaverant, eae sub C. Antistio ac deinde P. Silio legato ceterisque postea etiam latrociniis vacarent.*

⁶³ Dio 53, 29, 1-2; 54, 5, 1-3; 11, 2-7.

⁶⁴ Dessau, *ILS* 2648.

to one legion by the time of Vespasian, that legion remained there in permanence.

APPENDIX.

The Governors of the Spanish Provinces, 27-17 B. C.

I propose the following order of governors:—

Tarraconensis (Hispania Citerior)

- 27-24 C. Antistius Vetus (*cos.* 30 B. C.). Florus II, 33, 51; Orosius VI, 21, 6-7; Dio 53, 25, 7-8; Velleius II, 90, 4.
 24-22 L. Aemilius (Paullus Lepidus, *cos.* 34 B. C.). Dio 53, 29, 1.

or

- L. (Aelius) Lamia. Cassiodorus *Chron. ann.* 730.
 22-19 C. Furnius (*cos.* 17 B. C.). Florus II, 33, 51; Orosius VI, 21, 6-7; Dio 54, 5, 1-2.
 19-17 P. Silius Nerva (*cos.* 20 B. C.). Velleius II, 90, 4; *CIL* II, 3414.

Lusitania (Hispania Ulterior)

- 26-22 P. Carisius (perhaps never consul). Florus II, 33, 55-8; Orosius VI, 21, 10; Dio 53, 25, 8; 54, 5, 1-2.
 19 ? L. Sestius (*cos.* 23 B. C.). See below.

Notes. Though Hispania Ulterior had probably not yet been divided into imperial Lusitania and senatorial Baetica, the word Lusitania is here used for convenience. Kornemann ('Die Entstehung der Provinz Lusitanien,' *Festschrift für Hirschfeld*, p. 224, n. 5) proposed to arrange the legates of Tarraconensis in the following order: in 25, Vetus; 24, Aelius Lamia; 23, Silius Nerva; 22, Furnius. This order has been adopted by Marchetti (in Ruggiero's *Diz. Ep., s. v. Hispania*) and by Ritterling (P-W, *s. v. Legio*, col. 1221). This would be an unusually rapid change of governors in an imperial province, to say the least of it; and in the following notes I give reasons for rejecting it.

C. Antistius Vetus. Though his presence in Spain is not attested before the campaign of 26 B. C., he had probably arrived in the company of Augustus towards the end of the previous year to take the place of Sex. Appuleius who triumphed on Jan. 26th, 26 B. C. (*CIL* I², pp. 50, 77, 181).

L. Aemilius Paullus Lepidus. Dio (53, 29, 1) has Λούκιον Αἰμίλιον, but many scholars (Kornemann, Marchetti, Ritterling, Rice Holmes) have adopted the conjecture of Boissevain, Λούκιον Αἰλίον, for the name Lucius (Aelius) Lamia is provided by Cassiodorus. P-W, *s. v. L. Aelius Lamia* and *PIR*¹ mention

only the friend of Cicero, *equestris ordinis princeps* (*Ad. fam.* XI, 10, 2), and the consul of A. D. 3. Neither of these is a suitable candidate. *PIR*², however, admits another L. Aelius Lamia, the son of the former and the father of the latter. This is an eminently desirable and necessary invention. None the less it may be recalled that an eligible Aemilius does exist, L. Aemilius Paullus Lepidus (*cos.* 34 B. C.), the nephew of the triumvir (not the consul of A. D. 1, as Gardthausen, *Augustus u. seine Zeit* II, 2, p. 376, supposes). He had been a partisan of Augustus and became censor in 22 B. C. One of his sons was to marry Julia, the granddaughter of Augustus.

C. Furnius. See above, p. 301, for Gardthausen's exposure of the error of Florus. Yet Marchetti had no qualms about making Furnius contemporary with Antistius Vetus in Spain. For Professor Magie's view, see above, p. 301.

P. Silius Nerva. Velleius (II, 90, 4) provides no clear indication of date. Kornemann, Marchetti, and Ritterling place him in 23 B. C. Gardthausen in his narrative (I, p. 688) makes him succeed Furnius at some time *before* 19 B. C., but in his notes (II, 2, p. 377) says that Silius' governorship was probably *after* 20 B. C. In P-W (*s. v. P. Silius Nerva*) the date 19 B. C. is proposed—and is to be accepted. Not long after this he was active in Northern Italy, probably when proconsul of Illyricum (Dessau, *ILS* 899), and was able to profit from his experience of mountain warfare. The Alpine War of Silius is recorded by Dio under 16 B. C. (54, 20, 1-2) in a chapter resumptive of many events. It may well have covered both 17 and 16 B. C. Whether this be so or not, it would be reasonable to assign to his Spanish command a duration from 19 to 17 B. C.

P. Carisius. For the date of the capture of Lancia (26 or 25 B. C.) see above, p. 308; for the date of his founding of Emerita, p. 307. Dio calls him *Tíros Kapíσιος*, but the praenomen *P.* occurs on the coins. Gardthausen (II, 2, p. 375) suggested that the *P. Carisius* of the coins was celebrating his father's exploits, not his own.

L. Sestius. On a promontory of the coast of Callaecia stood three altars dedicated to Augustus by a certain Sestius: *tres arae Sestianae Augusto dicatae* (Pliny *NH* IV, 111; cf. Mela III, 13 and Ptolemy II, 6, 3). Hübner (P-W, *s. v. Arae Sestianae*) inferred that the common source of both Pliny and Mela was the *Chorographia* of Agrippa. This may or may not be so—if so, it provides a *terminus ante quem* for the erection of the altars. Hübner further suggested that the Sestius who set up the altars was L. Sestius, *cos.* 23 B. C. One might perhaps go further and suggest that when Sestius did this he was governor of Lusitania: a suitable date would be 19 B. C., the year of

the final and complete pacification of Spain. But this is mere conjecture.

The above data are of interest not merely for the elucidation of the Spanish Wars. They provide some information about the military men whom Augustus could trust and employ in the earlier years of his Principate, and evidence enough to refute the view that at this time a distinction was drawn between "praetorian" and "consular" provinces. Of four legates of Tarraconensis in the period 27-17 B. C. one (or two, if L. Aelius Lamia is admitted) was of praetorian standing. For Lusitania, the army of which must have been as large as that of Tarraconensis, the evidence is unfortunately not so abundant. Carisius, however, is not known ever to have been consul. Similar, though scanty, evidence is available from other provinces, for example, for Macedonia (M. Primus, a praetorian, was proconsul in 23 B. C., M. Lollius, a consular, *ca.* 19-18 B. C.) and, in the opinion of the present writer, for Galatia.

RONALD SYME.

TRINITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

POLYEUKTOS AND THE SOTERIA.

In a recent article in *Hermes*¹ Kolbe discusses anew the question of the founding of the Aetolian Soteria. The conclusion he reaches sustains the instinctive impression of everybody that a fête organized to commemorate the repulse of the Gauls from Delphi in 279/8 B. C. should have been founded soon after the event; and is, accordingly, a return to a position from which scholars have been forced reluctantly by the accumulation of evidence which they could not resist.

This may be considered under three heads:

(1) The time of the founding of the Soteria by the Aetolians admittedly coincides with the acceptance of their fête by the Athenians in the archonship of Polyeyktos (*IG*². II, 680); and, according to the view to which Kolbe returns, Polyeyktos was assigned to the epoch 277/6–275/4 B. C. The first to challenge this assignment was de Sanctis,² and his chief reason for so doing was the appearance in a decree (*IG*². II, 683), dated in the archonship of Hieron (immediate successor of Polyeyktos), of public sacrifices “on behalf of the Council and People of the Athenians, of their children and wives, and of King Antigonos” — a formula which (with appropriate variations) is usual in decrees belonging to the period 262–229 B. C. and is intelligible best (if not only) on the assumption that Athens was a Macedonian dependency.³ The weight of this point was weak so long as it could be contended that Athens was subject to Antigonos at some time between 288 and 262 B. C., but it increased in gravity with the gradual elimination of evidence that such was the case; and Kolbe is now able to cite in its support only one problematical document (*IG*². II, 678).⁴ This is a decree in

¹ 1933, pp. 440 ff.

² *Riv. di Fil.*, 1900, p. 58; 1923, pp. 167 ff.

³ Kolbe's comment (*o. c.*, p. 452) is as follows: Nur so viel lässt sich sagen, dass die Athener Antigonos in ihre Gebete einschlossen, um ihm ihre innere Anteilnahme zu bezeugen. It could not mean less. That it did mean more seems to me to be implied in its discontinuance after 229 B. C.

⁴ Published from Pococke's copy (*Inscr. antiq. gr. et lat.*, p. 56, no. 63). The alleged excision, on which Kolbe's argument rests, is doubt-

honor of the prytanes of Aigeis of the archonship of Eubulos; and its attribution to the period of the 'seventies has now to be called into question. We owe our text solely to a copy made by Pococke, its date to the natural assumption that the Eubulos in question is the Eubulos mentioned in the letters of Epicurus, who died in 271/0 B. C. A fragment of a prytany-decree of the same year has been found recently in the course of the American excavations in the Agora. This demands a later date. We have to reckon with a second Eubulos belonging to the Macedonian epoch.⁵ Public sacrifices for the king of Macedon are an anachronism in the 'seventies.

(2) What did most to constrain scholars to move Polyektos and Hieron down from the 'seventies to the 'fifties or later was the discovery that they had to do, not with two archons alone,

ful. Since, as Dow remarks, both the lost line (which had innocuous portions) and the one immediately preceding (14) ended in $\pi\alpha$, Pococke can easily have omitted line 15 inadvertently either when copying the inscription or preparing his transcript for the press. He does not note any omission at this point. The fault may, of course, go back to the stonecutter. Excisions are rare in records inscribed before 262 B. C.; cf. Johnson, *AJP.* 1913, p. 388; Dinsmoor, *Archons*, p. 507; *Hesperia*, 1933, pp. 497 ff., nos. 13-15. The only examples are *IG*². II, 665 (an ephebe list of Menekles' year) and *Hesperia*, 1933, p. 497, no. 13 (a prytany list, probably of the early third century), from which the tribal captions, Antigonis and Demetrias, were removed in 200 B. C.

The other document mentioned by Kolbe in this connection (*IG*². II, 677) has no relevance. Herakleitos of Athmonon was Macedonian general in the Piraeus in c. a. 250 B. C. (*IG*². II, 1225). Hence, quite apart from the appearance in *IG*². II, 677 of [$\tau\acute{o}\nu \epsilon\pi\iota \tau\eta\iota \delta\iota\omicron\iota\kappa\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota$]⁶—a good index in my judgment—, it is obvious that this decree does not belong in the 'seventies.

⁵ The document (*Agora Inven.* 1024) will be published in an early number of *Hesperia*. I owe my knowledge of it to Meritt and Dow, with whose kind permission I am enabled thus prematurely to make use both of it and the text cited below in n. 14. The space requires the restoration in line 5 of $\tau\acute{o}\nu \epsilon\pi\iota \tau\eta\iota \delta\iota\omicron\iota\kappa\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota$. The secretary of the Council and People, *Νεοπρόλεμος Δειπαδῖ(ώτης)*, was orator in Kallimedes' year (*IG*². II, 780, 246/5 B. C.). The *prytanis*, Kallistratos, son of Telesinos, of Erchia, was chairman of *proedri* in Diomedon's year (*IG*². II, 791). Another *prytanis*, Antiphon, son of Polyektos, of Phegia, had a son among the ephebes in Philoneos' year (*IG*². II, 766, 241/0 B. C.?); and yet another, Nikon, son of Theodoros, of Plotheia, was probably grandson of the secretary of the same name in 302/1 B. C.

but with five at least, probably six, and possibly more (*SEG.* II, 9); and it was this discovery which led Beloch⁶ to affirm flatly that there was no room for so many archons in the period prior to 264/3 B. C. Kirchner,⁷ Kolbe,⁸ Walek,⁹ and Lehmann-Haupt¹⁰ alone resisted this conclusion, and Kirchner has since recanted.¹¹ Kolbe reaffirms his position. It is now hardly tenable. The chances are strongly against our knowing all the archons who should be dated between the termination of the list preserved in Dion. Hal., *de Dinarcho* and the death of Epicurus.¹² Yet on placing Polyeuktos, Hieron, Diomedon, Theophemos, and Kydenor in the 'seventies we should have now the names of 21 archons who have to be dated in the 20 or 21 years between Philippos (293/1 B. C.) and Pytharatos (271/0 B. C.), viz., Aristonymos*,¹³ Charinos*, Kimon, Diokles, Diotimos*, Isaios*, Euthios, Urias*, Olbios,¹⁴ Gorgias, Anaxikrates (279/8 B. C.), Demokles (278/7 B. C.), Polyeuktos, Hieron, Diomedon, Theophemos, Kydenor, Eubulos*, Telekles*, Menekles, and Nikias Otryneus.¹⁵ That is to say, on including Xenophon, we

⁶ *Griech. Gesch.* IV, 2, p. 79.

⁷ *Phil. Woch.*, 1924, pp. 873 ff.

⁸ *Klio*, 1914, p. 268.

⁹ *Rev. de Phil.*, 1924, pp. 6 ff.

¹⁰ *Ἐπιτάφιος* to H. Swoboda, 1927, p. 165.

¹¹ *Gnomon*, 1932, pp. 456 ff.

¹² For the 132 years between 292/1 and 160/59 B. C. we have 87-90 archons; i. e., one third of them is still missing. On the other hand, only 6 or 7 are lacking between 292/1 and 230/29 B. C.

¹³ An asterisk designates archons mentioned in the letters of Epicurus.

¹⁴ A new text from the Agora, with the dating *Ἀρχων Οὐπίας* (cf. *IG²*. II, 658), brings Olbios into proximity with Urias. Like the decree published by Meritt in *Hesperia*, 1933, p. 156, no. 5 (Olbios archon) it was passed on the motion of Leon, son of Kichesias, of Aixone, grandfather of the ephebe of the same name in Kimon's archonship (*IG²*. II, 787, 237/6 B. C.). Both decrees deal with the same subject—praise of taxiarchs. Following Meritt, I now date Olbios in 277/6 B. C., instead of 266/5 or 247/6 (*Athenian Tribal Cycles*, pp. 35 ff.).

¹⁵ Menekles and Nikias Otryneus must precede Polyeuktos; cf. *IG²*. II, 681 and 665, *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, p. 102. Whether these two archons belong in 281/79 or 269/7 B. C. is a controversial question. Without accepting Dinsmoor's construction of *IG²*. II, 666, 667, justly rejected by Kolbe (*Gött. Nach.* 1933, p. 506) and Tarn (below), I see no difficulty in assuming that Strombichos, after having deserted to the Athenians and joined them in their attack on the Museion in 288

should have already one or two too many for the space available.¹⁶ The only reasonable way to obtain relief is to move elsewhere the Polyektos-Kydenor group.¹⁷

(3) We have now learned that Smyrna responded to the

B. C., was given Athenian citizenship only when he fought for them again in 269/8 B. C. An interval between his first service and his second is certain: it may have been 19 years or 6. A strong case for the shorter interval and the earlier date for Menekles and Nikias is made out by Tarn in an article in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* for 1934, entitled "The New Dating of the Chremonidean War", proofsheets of which he very kindly sent me. I accept his position on the chronology of this war (see below, pp. 330 f.): 267/6 B. C. is indubitably the right date for its opening. His argument for placing Menekles and Nikias in 281/79 B. C. is less conclusive. Without going into details, I think it can be adjusted to the later date without serious difficulty: Antigonos' recapture of the Piraeus might be the main outcome of the war in Menekles' year (269/8 B. C.)—a seizure which broke the *σπονδαί* of 279 B. C. I do not see that it follows from *IG*². II, 665, that the ephebes were the *only* guards of the Museion: *they* were there; other troops may have been with them. It seems to me that it is overstressing the *τοῦ* in *τοῦ πολέμου γενομένου* (*IG*². II, 666/7) to infer that Athens was involved in no war between B. C. 288 ff. and Menekles' year: *the* war need mean nothing more than "the war which was fresh in men's minds". What we should infer is that Strombichos did nothing distinguished in Olympiodoros' recovery of the Piraeus in 280 B. C. or in the struggle with the Gauls. This may seem curious; but *καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς χρεῖας ἀπροφασίστως παρασχόμενος διατετέλεκεν καὶ διαμεμένηκεν ἐν τεῖ τοῦ δήμου εὐνοίαι* may cover obscure services on these occasions. It is more curious that the failure to hold the Piraeus should have been followed by a string of honorary decrees (*IG*². II, 665, ll. 13 f.); and this conferment of rewards finds a more natural explanation if its occasion was the capture of the Piraeus. We must await a new document for a final settlement. As Tarn remarks, the Tribal Cycles are not involved in this question.

¹⁶ See Appendix A, pp. 332 ff.

¹⁷ A date for the group in ca. 250 B. C. has strong prosopographical support. The recurrence of the same individuals among the officials of the Salaminian *thiasos* of Bendis in the archonships of Hieron, Lysitheides, and Thersilochos (Dinsmoor, *Archons*, p. 91) places these archons closer together than is probable, not to say possible, when Hieron is dated in 276/5 B. C. Moreover, as Mr. Dow will demonstrate in a later study, the style of the preamble in *IG*². II, 679 (Polyektos archon) is anachronistic in the 'seventies: the formula of sanction (*ἔδοξεν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ*), centred and occupying a whole line, is not found otherwise until much later.

invitation of the Aetolians to recognize their Soteria at the earliest in 246 B. C. I have given reasons for thinking that an acceptance, thus belated, of a fête founded in 254 B. C. is unobjectionable in view of Greek practice in such matters.¹⁸ Kolbe has to assume that thirty years intervened. That is certainly less easy.

A solution of our problem which has found wide acceptance was presented by Roussel ten years ago.¹⁹ He claimed that there were two Soteria, one an annual Amphictyonic fête founded immediately after the repulse of the Gauls, and a second penteteric fête established by the Aetolians in the archonship of Polyeuktos. This solution Kolbe rejects; and it is the chief service of his article that he has compelled us to reëxamine the case. The basis of Roussel's thesis he leaves uncontested and it is uncontestable. The Delphian records fall into two groups, an earlier dated by the Delphian archon and the priest of the *technitai* in which all contestants are listed, and a later with an Aetolian as *agonothetes* and registering the victors alone. Kolbe's contention is that notwithstanding this difference, which he treats as unimportant, the identical organization of the musical part of the festival (with which alone our records deal) and the identically wide provenience of the contestants show that there was one and only one Soteria. I do not dispute the facts he adduces to sustain this conclusion. What I do dispute is the interpretation he gives to them. It is, of course, true that both *agones*, the Amphictyonic and the Aetolian, involved alike contests of *rhapsodoi*, *kitharistai*, *kitharodoi*, *choreutai*, *auletai*, *tragoidoi*, and *komoidoi*. But what else could an *agon* of this type involve? The performers at Delos in 284 B. C. were *tragoidoi*, *komoidoi*, *auletai*, *kitharodoi*, *psaltes*, *kitharistes*, and *rhapsodoi*, in addition to *choreutai* (*IG. XI 2*, 105); and while deviations from norm occurred both at Delphi (*Ditt. Syll³*. 424, n. 2) and at Delos, they were slight. The rigidity of musical programmes was obviously reflected and stereotyped by the organization of the guilds of *technitai*; and though the contestants were probably more numerous (since the victors alone were recorded), and the priest of the *technitai* is no longer

¹⁸ *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, pp. 128 ff.; cf. Tarn, *JHS.* 1933, p. 144; Flacelière, *REA.* 1933, pp. 325 ff.; Kolbe, *Hermes*, 1933, pp. 455 f.

¹⁹ *REA.* 1924, pp. 97 ff.

eponymous, there can be little doubt that the Aetolian *agonothetes*, like the Delphian archon, depended primarily upon the resources of the professional associations of artists.²⁰ The programmes of the Amphictyonic Soteria were modest: they contained fewer extras than those of the Athenian *technitai* who staged the musical *agones* of the Pythais in 128/7 and 106/5 B. C. (Ditt. *Syll*³. 698A, 711L), and the number of contestants, which was obviously limited and near the minimum in each class, was not greater. The wide provenience of the artists is unmistakable; cf. the Table presented by Kolbe (p. 442). In the archonship of Aristagoras (Ditt. *Syll*³. 424) the participants, including contestants and helpers, came from 31 different cities and *ethne* — from points as far distant as Bosporos, Naukratis, Chios, Abydos, Cyrene, Kassandreia, Ambracia, Miletus. "Wir sehen," remarks Kolbe, "dass die Soterien schon in der frühesten für uns greifbaren Epoche nicht nur von Künstlern aus der näheren Nachbarschaft besucht wurden. Neben Attika, Boiotien, Aitolien und der Peloponnes ist der griechische Westen mit den Ionischen Inseln, Ambrakia und Syrakus, der Osten mit Milet und Rhodos, der Norden mit Kassandreia, Philippi und Byzanz vertreten." The point, as it seems to me, is this: did they come to the Soteria from their distant homes or from the neighboring centres of the *technitai*? If from the latter, the only bearing of Kolbe's *data* is on the geographical and ethnic composition of the associations of artists. They yield nothing as to the character — Panhellenic or local — of the fête. Now there can be no doubt that the associations of *technitai* drew their members from all over the Greek world.²¹ In two cases it is expressly recorded that a *koinon* of *technitai* provided the programme of the Amphictyonic Soteria. In the first (a fragmentary document, *Fouilles de Delphes*, III 1, 477, dated by Flacelière, *BCH.* 1929, p. 441, no. 17c, in 264 B. C.) of the 18 contestants listed 5 belonged to Boeotia, 2 each to Hermione and Athens, and one each to Megalopolis, Stymphalos, Arcadia, Delphi, Kassandreia,

²⁰ Cf. Roussel, *BCH.* 1923, p. 17, n.

²¹ Poland, *Gesch. d. griech. Vereinswesens*, p. 327. The members of the Athenian *synodos* in the latter part of the second century B. C. were apparently all citizens of Athens, though some of them were citizens of more than one country simultaneously; cf. Klaffenbach, *Symbol. ad hist. coll. artif. Bacch.*, pp. 47 ff.

Sicyon, Syracuse, Argos, and Pella. In the second (again a fragmentary document, Ditt. *Syll*³. 489, dated by Flacelière, p. 442, no. 18, in 263 B. C.)²² of the six performers listed one each belonged to Hermione, Arcadia, Syracuse, Athens, and Megara. If we had the entire lists with their c. 75 names each, it is intelligible that they too should have come from 31 different cities or *ethne*. It is clear that the membership of the guild of Nemean and Isthmian *technitai* (which comes primarily in question) was almost as Panhellenic as that of a Hellenistic corps of mercenaries (*IG*². II, 1956). The connection of the associations of *technitai* with the Amphictyonic Soteria is proved definitely by the two documents just analyzed, must be assumed generally from the use of their priest's name in dating the records, and existed from the very beginning if the original grant of international privileges made by the Amphictyony to the Athenian guild in 278-277 B. C. (*IG*². II, 1132) coincides, as seems inevitable, with the inauguration by the Amphictyony of the fête commemorating the repulse of the Gauls from Delphi. The rôle of the artists was presumably the same then as at the refounding of the Museia at Thespieae (Ditt. *Syll*³. 457): they not only participated actively themselves but they sought to gain the adhesion of the "rest of the Greeks". It is not the provenience of the contestants but of the *theori* which attests the vogue of a fête and on this point the records of the Amphictyonic Soteria give no information. On the evidence, thus interpreted, the Amphictyonic Soteria may have been a local Delphian festival (an *epideixis* rather than an *agon*; cf. Robert, *BCH*. 1929, p. 38; *Fouilles de Delphes*, III 3, p. 91) staged by a neighboring guild of *technitai*, for which Panhellenic acceptance was never even solicited.

It had to be conceded by Roussel, and the point is stressed by Kolbe, that the texts²³ represent the Aetolians as the founders

²² For a better text see *SEG*. II, 339: τὸ κοινὸν τ[ῶ]ν τεχνιτῶν ἐπέδωκε τῶ[ι θεῶ]ι κ[αὶ] τοῖς Ἀμφικτύουσιν εἰς τὰ Σω[τήρια] τὸν ἀγῶνα παντελῆ. For the meaning of ἐπέδωκε see Ditt. *Syll*³. 690, n. 5, s. v. δωρεάν: *gratuito*, *idem quod alibi ἐπέδωκεν*, cf. n. 489. From the fact that exceptionally the *technitai* gave the programme as a gift it is a legitimate inference that ordinarily the Amphictyonic *agon* was χρηματίας and not στεφανίτης.

²³ *IG*². II, 680 (Ditt. *Syll*³. 408); Ditt. *Syll*³. 402; *Fouilles de Delphes*, III 1, 481-483.

of the penteteric Soteria and not as the reorganizers of an earlier fête. Kolbe contests with considerable success the cogency of the analogies adduced by Roussel to rid himself of the embarrassment thus presented to his theory. Let us concede that they are non-probative. The question, as we must now formulate it, is this: in what circumstances can the Aetolians have represented themselves as the founders of Soteria at Delphi if Soteria existed there already? The only possible answer seems to me to be that the Aetolians as a state had nothing to do with the founding or conduct of the earlier fête. Polyektos apart, there is not a shred of evidence that they had.²⁴ There is some evidence to the contrary. In 278-277 B. C. the Thessalian *hieromnemes* had the formal primacy in the Amphictyony (Ditt. *Syll.*³. 399), and in c. a. 264 and 263 B. C. the *technitai* gave the musical fête τῶι θεῷ καὶ τοῖς Ἀμφικτύουσιν.²⁵ Why are Zeus and the Aetolians omitted? The mere fact that there were Aetolian *hieromnemes* and that the Aetolian League had a preponderance of influence in that body does not make an Amphictyonic act an act of the Aetolian League; and conversely an act of the Aetolian League was not an Amphictyonic act. We have two separate jurisdictions. It is, I think, significant that in the records of Polyektos' year the Aetolians do not claim Amphictyonic sanction for their foundation; ²⁶ they emphasize, rather,

²⁴ It is no evidence (cf. Kolbe, *Hermes*, 1933, p. 450) that they themselves commemorated their victory over the Gauls.

²⁵ *Fouilles de Delphes*, III 1, 477; Ditt. *Syll.*³. 489. Unless "the god" (i. e., Apollo) is particularized because the record covers only the musical features of the fête, it seems likely that the annual Soteria honored Apollo alone, the penteteric Zeus and Apollo. This is all the more probable since there is no evidence that the annual festival included anything but musical features. "The god" reappears as the recipient of the *agon* of the "winter Soteria" (Ditt. *Syll.*³. 690). In the Coan decree of 278 B. C. the sacrifices offered to Zeus Soter, the Pythian Apollo, and Nike were local. Incidentally, the natural time for the founding of the Amphictyonic Soteria was the Pythia of 278 B. C., and, if this year had not been preoccupied by the archon Demokles, and thus unavailable for Polyektos, we should never have thought of 277, 276, or 275 B. C. It is not the least merit of Roussel's theory that it enables us to date the original organization of Soteria at Delphi in the right moment.

²⁶ In the later document (*Fouilles de Delphes*, III, I, 483) the phrase appears, [τάς] τε θυσίας τοῖς θεοῖς καθότι ὁ θεὸς ἔχρησεν ἀξίως. It precedes

their own formal responsibility. On the best interpretation of the evidence, as Kolbe rightly affirms, the Aetolian Soteria were penteteric. On the best interpretation of the *agonic* records the Amphictyonic Soteria were annual. Certainly in the years immediately preceding the appearance of the Aetolian *agonothetes* they were not penteteric. Contestants cannot have remained "boys" for thirteen or seventeen years. If, unlike Thespieae and Miletus in reorganizing the Museia and Didymeia, the Aetolians failed to link their Soteria to the preëxistent fête, we may assume that they did so deliberately: it was probably good policy, in seeking Panhellenic acceptance for their own fête, to represent it as a new creation. And they had all the more reason for affirming the essential originality of their project in that the earlier fête concerned the Amphictyones alone, while theirs was to comprehend all the Hellenes. They chose as the basis of their festival an exploit that was 25 years old because, doubtless, they had no more recent ground for an effective appeal. Curiously enough an Athenian official in the Macedonian service in *c. a.* 250 B. C. chose Antigonos' equally remote achievement in "saving the Hellenes from the barbarians" for a commemorative memorial (*IG.* II², 677). There was still stuff for Panhellenic propaganda in an episode which dated back a quarter of a century.

Thus far I have been unable to find much helpfulness in Kolbe's suggestions. What follows began with a conversation I had with him in Athens last summer, and I take pleasure in acknowledging my debt to him for indicating a new approach to an old problem. In our conversation he stressed the significance of the difference between the earliest caption preserved in the chronological portion of the inventory of Asklepios *IG*². II, 1534B and the rest of these captions. The former runs (ll. 203 f.): καὶ τὰ ἀνατ[εθέντα ἐφ' ἱερέως Λυσικλ]έου Συναληγτ; the others consist simply of καὶ τὰδε ἐφ' ἱερέως Προκλέους Πειρ[α],

another phrase not found in the related texts, -ον τήν τε ἐπιφάνειαν τῶν θεῶν καὶ (Flacelière, *REA.* 1933, pp. 326 f.). I suggest that these phrases emanate from an Amphictyonic text formulated after the dispatch of the Aetolian *theori*. The amphictyones must have accepted the Aetolian foundation. Otherwise their names would not appear at the head of the records. Their jurisdiction over the fête is proved by Ditt. *Syll*³. 539?, 545, 598; *GDI.* 2528, 2529.

Λυκίου 'Ραμνο, κτλ. Kolbe urged that with "and those dedicated in the priesthood of Lysikles of Sypalettos" we have to do not only with the earliest preserved record of chronologically arranged items but with the first in the entire series; inferring (1) that the inventory began when Lysikles was priest, and (2) that the archon P—, with whose year the inventory began (l. 145), was consequently synchronous with Lysikles.²⁷ Without making Kolbe's inferences I had often canvassed the possibility that this change of formula meant something, but was always deterred from accepting it by the lack of rigorous consistency displayed by Athenian scribes and specifically by the warning of IG². II, 1533 where a similar abbreviation of caption means nothing whatsoever.²⁸ There is now something further to be added.

The inventory consists of three sections: I, articles for use in cult (*Frg. ab* and π); II, dedications of the ordinary type; and III, dedications arranged chronologically by priesthoods. Since the articles in section II are indistinguishable in character, descriptions, and weights from those in section III, it has been assumed hitherto that they too were arranged chronologically under priesthoods, and that it is only because of the damage sustained by the stone that the captions separating one

²⁷ See now *Gött. Nach.* 1933, pp. 495 ff. where Kolbe develops his view more fully. He says (p. 496): Nur wenn man sich entschliesst, die Ergänzung Peithidemos anzunehmen und diesen Archon, wie Sundwall s. Z. vorschlug, 266/5 zu setzen, kommen die Priester (Phileas of Eitea and Kalliadēs of Aigilia) ins Jahr 263/2 zu stehen. Aber selbst wenn dieses Datum zutrifft, kann die Methode des Priestercyklus nicht als brauchbar bezeichnet werden, weil die Gleichung $263/2 = XII$ mit der überlieferten Gleichung, dass in Isaïos' Jahr ein Priester aus Phyle X fungiert hat, nicht in Uebereinstimmung zu bringen ist. My cycle of "allotted priests" between 288/7 and 277/6 B. C. he disposes of as a Notbehelf. He cannot deny the reality of such cycles: demonstrably they existed not only for the prytanies but also for the archons and the priests of Hagne Aphrodite (*Athenian Tribal Cycles*, pp. 50 ff.; 162 ff.). And even if the appearance in Isaïos' archonship of a priest of Asklepios from Hippothontis (X) were an unexplained breach of cyclic regularity, I do not see how it can weigh with Kolbe against dating Lysikles the priest and Peithidemos the archon in 266/5 B. C., seeing that such breaks are precisely what he postulates.

²⁸ Lines 9 and 18 have τὰδε ἀνετέθη ἐπὶ Διοκλέους (Λυσιμάχου) ἱερέ; line 29 has simply ἐπὶ Τιτίου ἱερέ.

group from another are lacking. This assumption was legitimate, perhaps, when we had to do with the opening seventeen lines of *Frg. c-k* alone, the first of which had only twelve letters, the eighth only 44, while even the last three fell short of the full complement of *c.* 128 by over twenty letters; but now that *Frg. vo*, with 23 lines, the longest of which has 36 letters, has to be inserted in this part of the stone,²⁹ the total absence of group headings (καὶ τὰ ἀνατεθέντα ἐφ' ἱερέως -- is what we should expect) can no longer be attributed to chance. Surely some one of them, if only in part, should be found in these fragments if they had ever been there. We have to do, I believe, at the opening of the inventory proper with an undivided aggregate of dedications, numerous enough to represent the accumulation of six or seven priesthoods,³⁰ and, seeing that *Frg. ab* and π do not form a join with *Frg. c-l*, of as many more as we may desire. Since sections II and III contain offerings attributed to ten priests serving earlier than Lysikles, we naturally think that the dedications of ten priesthoods (at least) were involved in this aggregate. Since this inventory cannot have contained dedications made before the last inventory was completed, it follows that *IG*². II, 1534A stopped ten years (at least) before Lysikles was priest.

How shall we account for the intervening block of dedications? There are two possibilities: (1) that the Commissioners in charge of the inventory began by listing the dedications regardless of the priesthoods in which they were dedicated, — in which case P— was archon ten years before Lysikles; (2) that P— was archon in the year of Lysikles or the year immediately before, the intervening block being the accumulation of dedications formed since the last inventorying and, in accordance with Athenian practice, handed over to his successor by the priest who had them in his charge. Accepting possibility (1) P— would remain in the year 276/5 B. C., where I have placed him in *Athenian Tribal Cycles*; and in favor of this solution it may be urged that in the preceding inventory (*IG*². II, 1534A) the dedications were not listed chronologically by priesthoods. But

²⁹ *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, pp. 60, n. 1; 118 f.

³⁰ *Frg. vo* shows us that the minimum is not 17 lines (*frg. c-k*) but 23. For the estimate cf. Dinsmoor, *Archons*, p. 157; Ferguson, *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, pp. 41 f.

the underlying assumption, that the Commissioners who drafted *IG*². II, 1534B took *IG*². II, 1534A as their model, will not hold. In *IG*². II, 1534A the dedications are grouped according to their positions in the temple, whereas those in *IG*². II, 1534B, section II, are not grouped at all. Moreover, this possibility leaves unexplained why the Commissioners, after having begun to list the dedications on one system (an extraordinary one at that), subsequently changed to another. Let us then turn to possibility (2). We have evidence that a *paradosis* was involved somehow in *IG*². II, 1534B. This is found in line 329 of *Frg.* π, which belongs to the neighborhood of *Frg.* αβ.³¹ There we have the mutilated phrase *τάδε ὦμ παρε*. It is obviously a caption and can be construed perfectly well as the caption of our ungrouped block. By whom was the *paradosis* made and to whom?³² The ὦμ is unparalleled in such formulae. It implies that two categories (at least) are involved. One must be the accumulation of past years. The transmitting priest may be Lysikles, as Kolbe surmised; in which case the second consisted of the articles entered some forty lines later under the caption *καὶ τὰ ἀνατ[εθέντα ἐφ' ἱερέως Λυσικλέου Συναληττ* (*epeteia*, to use the language of the inventories of the fifth century). But the ὦμ seems to call for a less remote designation of the residue. If the block of ungrouped dedications consisted of one category only we should expect to find the normal caption *τάδε παρέδωκεν ὁ ἱερεὺς - - τῷ ἱερεῖ - - παραλαβὼν παρὰ τοῦ ἱερέως - -*, instead of the more complex heading introduced by *τάδε ὦμ παρε - -*. From the ὦμ we naturally infer that the caption itself contained a second member; and for the purpose of showing the possible construction and bringing out the meaning I suggest the following approximate restoration: *τάδε ὦμ παρέ[λαβεν παρὰ τοῦ ἱερέως Τιμοκλέου Εἰρεσίδ τὰ ἀπὸ — ἄρχοντος*³³ *ἀνατεθέντα ὁ ἱερεὺς Ἀρχικλῆς Λακιάδ παρέδωκεν τῷ ἱερεῖ Λυσικλεῖ Συναληττ*]. The transmitting priest is then (as suggested in the restoration) the predecessor of Lysikles, Archikles of Lakiadai, — in which case he, and not

³¹ *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, p. 38.

³² A *paradosis* by the last priest was basic for the entire inventory *IG*². II, 1534A; cf. Kolbe, *Hermes*, 1916, p. 545, n. 1; Dinsmoor, *Archons*, p. 154.

³³ According to the suggestion made in Appendix A, I should insert *Ξενοφώντας* here. Naturally this formula may have been abridged.

Lysikles, is synchronous with P—. The complexity of the formula may be attributed to the predicament of the Commissioners in that they were required to make their inventory begin with the dedications of P—'s archonship yet desired to include in it those which had accumulated since the last inventory was drafted. They attained their object, we may conclude, by entering at the beginning under a double-claused caption the entire content of the *traditio* made by the first priest to the second. There was no need of subdividing the *ex-votos* since all alike were subject to a single *paradosis*.

Provisionally, however, we may leave the question open whether P— was synchronous with Lysikles or Archikles, especially since we cannot be certain that *τάδε ὅμ παρ-* is the caption of section II. There seems to be no other group of which it *can* be the caption, for the caption of section I appears in line 166. But the stone is very much damaged. On any reasonable construction of the document it seems inevitable, once we restore P— as Peithidemos (see below), that he was synchronous with one or the other.

It is now high time to note a fact which we owe to the acumen of Mr. Sterling Dow. He noticed that the letter following the initial Π of the archon's name in line 145 of *IG*². II, 1534B (ἐ]ν τῷ Ἀσκληπιείῳ ἀπὸ Π—) is not omikron, as I had surmised,³⁴ or upsilon, as Dinsmoor conjectured,³⁵ but, as clear traces indicate, epsilon; and the reading was verified on the stone by Professor Meritt and myself. It so happens that the only archon-name beginning with Pe- which we possess for the third century is Peithidemos,³⁶ in office at the opening of the Chremonidean War. In *Athenian Tribal Cycles*³⁷ I left it an open question whether Peithidemos belonged in 270/69 (as Dinsmoor had concluded) or in 267/6 B. C. — the only alternative permitted by an unbroken system of secretary cycles.³⁸

³⁴ *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, pp. 42, n. 1; 81 ff.

³⁵ *Archons*, pp. 81, 155, 160.

³⁶ Cf. above, p. 320, n. 12.

³⁷ Pp. 73 ff. I withdraw the slight preference there expressed for 270/69 B. C.; cf. Kirchner, *Gnomon*, 1932, p. 453. *IG*². II, 1273, dated in the year after Nikias, may be restored [Ἐπὶ Πειθιδήμου]; cf. Kirchner, note; Dinsmoor, *Archons*, p. 67.

³⁸ 265/4 B. C. is too late. 266/5 is preoccupied by Philokrates (*IG*². II, 684, 685), in whose year the philosopher Polemon died. Kolbe (*Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1933, p. 2222) is possibly right in saying

There can now, I think, be little doubt that he belongs in 267/6 B. C.³⁹ — the year preceding the priesthood of Lysikles of Sypallettos. And the date thus won for Peithidemos confirms the date (266/5 B. C.) given by me to this priesthood. Fortified by yet another "coincidence" the list of priests of Asklepios stands as given by me in *Athenian Tribal Cycles* (pp. 23 f.).⁴⁰

that nach der Eusebianischen Ueberlieferung Polemon died in 270/69 or 268/7 B. C. When he actually died is another question. According to the same tradition (Jacoby, *FGH. IIBD*, p. 738) Zeno died either in 269/8, 268/7, or 264/3 B. C. Since he actually died in 262/1 B. C., I see no objection in placing the death of Polemon in 266/5 B. C. if the Tribal Cycles demand it. Naturally neither Dinsmoor nor I treat the archonship of Philokrates in 266/5 B. C. as a fixed point.

³⁹ Tarn (*loc. cit.* above, p. 321, n. 15) has now presented an unanswerable case against 270/69 B. C. The date of Areus' death (265 B. C.) is decisive. In Antipatros' archonship (263/2 B. C.) Rhamnus, as well as the Piraeus (Tarn), was in the hands of Antigonos (*IG². II*, 1217).

⁴⁰ According to Kolbe's arrangement of the archons between Philippos and 276/5 B. C. (*Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1933, p. 2224; *Hermes*, 1933, p. 454; *Gött. Nach.* 1933, p. 511) the official order was preserved in all three periods (comprising 8 of the 16 or 17 years) in which we have "closed sequences": (1) Diokles-Diotimos-Isaios-Euthios, (2) Menekles-Nikias Otryneus, (3) Polyuktos-Hieron, and broken at each interval as well as before and after (not necessarily immediately). It looks like a conspiracy to mislead. Since the purpose of the system was to secure equality of tribal representation in the secretarial office, it would have been absurd to use tribal rotation at all had such irregularities occurred. In postulating sporadic breaches of cycles Kolbe seems to me to ignore the inevitability that the *phylae* saw to it that they should secure their turns when they were due. The system of tribal rotation, fundamental in Athenian public law, permitted inequalities of representation only when new cycles were inaugurated. It would have broken down entirely if this was done frequently or with insufficient motivation. When a new beginning was made, as in 263/2, 201/0, and 110/09 B. C., other considerations than cyclic continuity might enter in. Incidentally, I should like to observe that the seeming impossibility of finding a place in the priestly cycle for Leonides of Phlya (V), priest of Asklepios in *IG². II*, 1019, is due solely to a mistake in interpreting this document shared by Kolbe (*Gött. Nach.* 1933, p. 487) with his predecessors, including myself. There is not the slightest reason for the assumption commonly made that Leonides was priest in the archonship of Ple[istainos]. Among the *ἀναθήματα*, some of them described as *ἀρχαία*, which were to be repaired by a Commission appointed in Leonides' priesthood appears an object dedicated by the ephebes of Ple[istainos]' year. Manifestly, Ple[istainos] may have been archon any number of years before Leonides.

Consequently Diomedon belongs in 253/2 ⁴¹ and Polyeuktos in 255/4 B. C. ⁴²

Why the Council and People decided in 253/2 B. C. to begin the inventory in Peithidemos' archonship, instead of nine years earlier where *IG*². II, 1534A had left off, we can only surmise. It may have been because in this year the Chremonidean War began, thus inaugurating a new epoch in the history of Athens; it may have been because an inventory covering the decade 276/5-267/6 B. C. had been compiled already, awaiting inscription on stone; it may have been because in 267/6 B. C. a new secretary-cycle began, for the Council and People were more prone to observe secretarial than priestly periods in beginning and ending records. Whatever the reason, we see that the Commissioners conformed to their orders, yet by listing under Peithidemos' year the accumulation of *ex-votos* for the nine years since the last inventory was inscribed, they obviated a *lacuna* in their record and increased the amount of gold and silver to be melted down for the making of new articles of cult. In any case the total inventory was made to cover two priestly cycles precisely.

APPENDIX A (above, p. 321, n. 16).

Kolbe (*Gött. Nach.* 1933, pp. 493 ff.) escapes from this *impasse* by moving Philippos back to 293/2 B. C., but enters it again by dating Xenophon before 271/0 B. C. I quite agree with him as to Xenophon. Beloch's transfer of this archon to the Macedonian epoch (252/1 B. C.; cf. *Griech. Gesch.* IV 2, pp. 86, 96) was rash: it involves the emergence of Phaidros of Sphettos as a dominating political figure after twenty years of retirement, and his tenure of the chief generalship when, if alive, he must have been eighty years of age; cf. Kirchner, *Gnomon*, 1932, p. 453. The year 276/5 B. C. has now become free for Xenophon.

⁴¹ See Appendix B, pp. 334 ff.

⁴² Kolbe's argument (*Hermes*, 1933, pp. 447 f.) that the Aetolian Soteria were founded in a non-Pythian year is inconclusive. It takes account of one possibility, neglecting another which suggests itself as probable to any one conversant with the habits of political meetings: that, since the Chians were assembled and had voted to send *theori* to the Soteria, they should have selected them for the first celebration of the fête at once, before adjourning, and not have postponed this action till the stated time for selecting *theori* for the Pythia. In the future no occasion for meeting separately for the election of the new *theori* was contemplated or desired.

In *IG*². II, 1534A, l. 8, we have ἐπι, not ἐπ' 'E as in the *Corpus*. This was observed by Mr. Sterling Dow and verified on the stone by Professor Meritt and myself. E[ubulos] accordingly disappears from this record. The honorary decree for Phaidros was passed in, or shortly after, 262/1 B. C. When Xenophon is placed in 276/5 B. C. Phaidros becomes the "first" hoplite-general of Athens after the accession of Antigonos to the throne of Macedon. In the circumstances in which *IG*². II, 682 was passed no better explanation of πρῶτος in line 44 is possible. (274/3 B. C. was suggested in *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, pp. 71 ff. because 276/5 B. C. seemed preoccupied by P-, for which see now above, pp. 328-331). The excision of lines 48-52 is intelligible, when Xenophon is dated in 276/5 B. C., if they recorded Phaidros' success in effecting an adjustment between Athens and Macedon at this critical moment.

Kolbe's case for making Olympiodoros archon twice in the one year 294/3 B. C. needs further consideration. I was surprised to read his affirmation (*Gött. Nach.* 1933, p. 508): Dagegen ist mehrfach bezeugt, dass ein im Laufe seines Amtsjahres bestätigter *Eponymos* als ὕστερος oder δεύτερος bezeichnet wird, *IG*². II, 644 Nikias *hysteros*. I can find no example in Attic decrees of a second case of ὕστερος, or any instance in which δεύτερος occurs in the sense in which ὕστερος is used in *IG*². II, 644; δεύτερος, in substitution for ἐμβόλιμος, is used as a synonym for ὕστερος in records of the second century B. C. That is all. What is more, the decree published by Dinsmoor (*Archons*, pp. 7 ff. = *IG*². II, 649) and *IG*². II, 389, both enacted on the last day of Munychion, when taken together and construed as by Dinsmoor and Kolbe (p. 508), show that the year of these decrees was not divided as 296/5 B. C. was: there was seemingly no second Council. Let us examine the matter a little more closely. In the one decree the last day of Munychion synchronizes with the first day of the tenth prytany, in the other with the first day of the eleventh prytany. If δεκάτης had appeared as the number of the prytany in *IG*². II, 389, in which Olympiodoros is termed δεύτερος, and ἐνδεκάτης in Dinsmoor's new inscription, in which Olympiodoros is found without δεύτερος, we might assume, on the analogy of *IG*². II, 644, that a second Council *did* exist, beginning at the end of the first prytany-month of the year. But the reverse is the case. There is, indeed, a chance that the scribe of Dinsmoor's decree, following, possibly, official construction, ignored altogether the twelfth of the calendar year 294/3 B. C. prior to the revolution postulated to account not only for δεύτερος and the reëmergence of *anagrapheis* but also for the addition of Demetriaia to the urban Dionysia and the disappearance of the *exetastes* and trittyrachs as budgeting officials (cf. *IG*². II, 646, and Dinsmoor's new decree); and, hence, numbered the eleventh prytany "tenth" and failed to designate Olympiodoros as "second". A remodelling of the Athenian government in August, 294 B. C., with reminiscences of the oligarchy of 321-319 B. C., would not be untimely, seeing that it would synchronize pretty closely with the seizure of the

Macedonian throne by Poliorcetes (*Class. Phil.* 1929, pp. 20 ff.). There is also a chance, however, that *δεκάτης* is simply a scribal error, as Dinsmoor and Kolbe assume. If there was no second Council, why should there have been a second term for the archon? If there was a second term for the archon, the *anagrapheus* doubtless belonged to the second part of the year alone: there should have been a secretary for the first portion; and he should belong to the twelfth *phyle*. But, like the archon and the first prytany, he might have been assumed not to exist.

If Dinsmoor's restoration of *IG*². II, 389, ll. 1 f. (*ἀρχοντος δευτέ[ρου ξτος]*) should give way to Kolbe's (*ἀρχοντος δευτέ[ρου ἐπὶ]*), as seems to me probable despite the fact that *ἐπὶ* is one space too short for the *lacuna*, Dinsmoor's contention that Olympiodoros was archon in two distinct years is not to be excluded. It is true that Greek usage favors *τὸ δεύτερον* for a second year. Examples abound in the Delphian inscriptions, and from Athens we have the instance cited by Kolbe, *Μήδειος τὸ δεύτερον* (*Ath. Mitt.*, 1898, p. 26; cf. *τὸ Β'*, *Hesperia*, 1933, pp. 505 ff., no. 17). But the Parian Chronicle (Jacoby, *FGH*. IIB, p. 998) presents us with *ἀρχοντος Ἀθήνησι Δαμασίου τοῦ δευτέρου*. I think that we cannot be certain that *δευτέρου* does not mean "for a second year". And, after all, the archon-list in Dion. Hal. *de Dinarcho* is one name too short without a second Olympiodoros.

Kolbe's restoration of *IG*². II, 378, [*Ἐπὶ Φιλίππου ἀρχοντος καὶ ἀναγραφέως, κτλ.*], is undoubtedly better than Dinsmoor's [*Ἐπὶ Ὀλυμπιοδότη ἀρχοντος*] *ἀναγραφέως, κτλ.* The asyndeton is harsh. We have, I believe, to concede that the regime which supplanted *grammateis* with *anagrapheis* existed in the middle of Philippos' year. Its discontinuance was probably a consequence of the recall of the exiles by Poliorcetes in that archonship.

So far as the Tribal Cycles are concerned Philippos can be dated in 293/2 B. C. without disturbing the sequence which begins with Antigonis (I) in 291/0 B. C. We shall have to leave the secretary-quality of 292/1 B. C. undetermined. The year may have been given to Antiochis (XII) in compensation for its loss of the office in 294/3 B. C. The adjustment would be yet simpler should we assign two years to Olympiodoros: we should assume that in the first year of this archon, no documents being extant, the secretary functioned as usual and came from Antiochis (XII).

APPENDIX B (above, p. 332, n. 41).

Kolbe makes the Diomedon of *IG*². II, 1534B a second archon of this name (*Hermes*, 1933, p. 454, n. 3). This is a necessary corollary to dating Polyuktos in 277/6 B. C.; otherwise the priest of Asklepios for the archonship of Isaïos (*IG*². II, 1163) would collide with one of the priests in the "closed sequence" Lysikles-Boiskos. If the last letter of line 4 of *IG*². II, 791 cannot be a delta, I should agree with Kolbe; but the stone itself is, to say the least, ambiguous. There is a

cross-bar in this letter. No one who has examined the stone can deny the fact. The sole question is as to its interpretation. The cross-bar was there when the stone was discovered (Dow, *Hesperia*, 1933, p. 428, n. 5). As pointed out in *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, pp. 16 ff. (where Dow is responsible for everything written to the end of the paragraph), it is fainter than the uprights and shows only slight traces of the normal discoloration at its bottom; but these characteristics are accounted for by the flaking of the surface of the stone near the break. Skilled epigraphists who have studied the stone, like Meritt and Dow, do not doubt that a delta is possible, and Roussel (*REA*, 1924, pp. 98 ff.; 1932, p. 198, n. 9) goes farther.

Kolbe (*Gött. Nach.*, 1933, p. 500) finds in *IG*². II, 834 proof that the Diomedon of *IG*². II, 791 belongs later than 253/2 B. C. I should agree with him if his interpretation of the text were certain: Eurykleides cannot have had a son 30 years of age in 253/2 B. C. unless he were between 90 and 100 in 211/0 B. C.; yet in this year he was still active politically. The opening lines of *IG*². II, 834 run as follows:

στρατιώτ[. . . ἐ]γλε[πο]ντ[α - - - - -]
ἐπιμέλειαν· [κα]ὶ τὴν τῶν στρατι[ωτικῶν ταμείαν διε]-
ξήγαγεν διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ προανήλωσεν [κ]αὶ [αὐτὸς οὐ]-
κ ὀλίγα χρήματα· καὶ ἀγωνοθέτης ὑπακούσας, κτλ.

I owe the readings of line 1 to Mr. Dow; also the determination that ταμείαν (suggested by Hiller, *Ditt. Syll*³. 497, n. 1) satisfies the requirement of space in line 2 better than ἀρχήν. If this text can mean only what Kolbe alleges—that Eurykleides, when he conducted the treasurer-ship through his son, was himself *tamias* and his son simply his agent—it is most improbable that he was *tamias* in 253/2 B. C. But if it can mean that his son was the official holder of the office while he himself not only put him forward as a candidate but also advanced him funds (προανήλωσεν), we should have to infer two things: (1) that Eurykleides had been *tamias* already, and (2) that he can have been *tamias* as early as 253/2 B. C. I think that τὴν - - - ταμείαν διεξήγαγεν διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ will bear this meaning. The alternative—that an official should turn over to his son the office to which he had been elected and record the transfer in a claim for public recognition—is unparalleled, and would have been needlessly provocative. The transaction must have been challenged at his *euthyna*. There is surely no indication in *IG*². II, 791 that the son replaced the father: he does not even appear among the contributors there listed. The broken text of line 1, with which τὴν τῶν στρατιωτικῶν ταμείαν is connected by καί, can concern another office previously held by Eurykleides: καί is the copulative commonly used in this decree. This office may have been Eurykleides' own treasurer-ship; in which case the construction given by me to διεξήγαγεν διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ becomes imperative. Eurykleides could not have been *tamias* twice: double tenure of this office by the same person is unknown. Evasion of the prohibition against iteration by putting forward a son as the nominal holder is well attested (*IG*². II, 834, l. 8; 682, ll. 56 ff.).

But the broken text permits various restorations, and the one which suits best the traces of letters and the requirements of space is perhaps στρατιώτ[as τὰ ἐ]γλεί[πο]ντ[α - -] ἐπιμέλειαν. The office may, therefore, have been a generalship (cf. for ἐπιμέλειαν used of a military office *IG*². II, 1299, l. 56).

It must be added that Dow (*Hesperia*, 1933, p. 442, n. 1) has given an additional reason for not dating *IG*². II, 791 in the neighborhood of 229 B. C. He observes that, although this record preserves 62 names with demotics of leading men of Athens and *IG*². II, 1706 (230/29—213/2 B. C.) preserves 92, "neither list repeats a single name-plus-demotic of the other."

Whether there were two Diomedons or only one is still an open question.

WILLIAM S. FERGUSON.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

SUETONIUS, *AUGUSTUS*, II, 2.

In his *Lives* Suetonius is careful to give, where possible, information about the ancestry of the emperors. This information is not always accurate. For example, in *Nero* II he ascribes to a single man the activities of Cn. Domitius, consul in 122 B. C., and of his son of the same name, consul in 96 B. C. This error has been commented upon frequently, but no one seems to have noticed an almost certain error in his account of the great-grandfather of Augustus. The passage is as follows:

Primus ex hac (gente) magistratum populi suffragio cepit C. Rufus. Is quaestorius Cn. et C. procreavit, a quibus duplex Octavio-
rum familia defluxit condicione diversa, siquidem Gnaeus et deinceps ab eo reliqui omnes functi sunt honoribus summis; at Gaius eiusque poster-
i, seu fortuna seu voluntate, in equestri ordine constiterunt usque ad Augusti patrem. Proavus Augusti secundo Punico bello stipendia in Sicilia tribunus militum fecit Aemilio Papo imperatore (Suet., *Aug.* II, 2).

Except for the praenomen of Rufus, Drumann accepted this without question, and the same is true of Groebe's revision of Drumann, as well as of Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography* and of Shuckburgh's edition of Suetonius' *Augustus*, both of which go back to the old Drumann.¹ In view of this unanimity in what appears to be an error, it may be worth while to examine the matter.

The L. Aemilius Papus under whom the ancestor of Augustus served as military tribune was praetor in Sicily in 205 B. C.² We do not know the normal age for the military tribunes at this time, but when the later Africanus held this office in 216 at the age of twenty, he was regarded as very young,³ and to judge from other examples found in Livy's third decade, the average in-

¹ W. Drumann, *Geschichte Roms in Seinem Uebergange von der Republikanischen zur Monarchischen Verfassung*, 1834-44, IV, pp. 218 ff.; the same, revised by P. Groebe, 1902-29, IV, pp. 234 ff.; W. Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, 1899, III, pp. 6 ff.; E. S. Shuckburgh, *C. Suetoni Tranquilli Divus Augustus*, 1896, p. 3.

² Livy, XXVIII, 38, 11-13.

³ Livy, XXII, 53, 3.

terval between the military tribunate and the praetorship was about five years. It is safe to say that this Octavius was at least 25 years old in 205, and therefore that he was born in 230 or earlier. But according to Suetonius he was the great-grandfather⁴ of Augustus, who was born in 63. That gives 167 years for the three generations, an average of nearly 56 years for each generation. While possible, this is extremely improbable, especially as the recurrence of the praenomen Gaius⁵ suggests that in each generation we are dealing with the eldest son, and we can hardly escape the conclusion that Suetonius has missed at least a generation. If we add one more generation, we still get an average length of 42 years, which is rather long, but within reason. Another additional generation is needed to reduce the average length to 33 years, which is considered normal.

Suetonius tells us that the first Octavius to hold high office was Gnaeus, son of the quaestor C. Octavius Rufus. This Gnaeus has been identified with certainty as the praetor of 205,⁶ who had been military tribune at Cannae in 216.⁷ However, if the Cn. Octavius Cn. f. Cn. n., who was consul in 165,⁸ is his son, Rufus' praenomen was not Gaius but Gnaeus, and Drumann is quite certainly right in believing that the C. in Suetonius is an error for Cn. The quaestorship of Rufus would have been about 230. Suetonius seems to place at least one generation between Rufus and Gaius, the military tribune of 205. This is not necessary and seems improbable. The failure of Gaius to advance to higher office (even if we allow four generations from him to Augustus, it can hardly be supposed that he died young) suggests a lack of ability or ambition or both,

⁴ It is true that *proavus* may mean "ancestor," but here where it stands at the beginning of one sentence contrasted in a way typical of Suetonius with *avus* at the beginning of the next, it must have its regular meaning of "great-grandfather." It seems always to have been so understood, e. g., in the translations of Forester, Stahr, Rolfe, and Rat.

⁵ Cf. C. I. L., I², p. 199: C. Octavius C. f. C. n. C. pr. pater Augusti.

⁶ Livy, XXVIII, 38, 11-13. Cf. Drumann-Groebe, *op. cit.*, p. 244.

⁷ Frontinus, *Strat.*, IV, 5, 7. Some of the older editions here read C. Octavius against the better Mss. which have Cn. Misled by this Drumann identified the military tribune of 216 with Gaius, the military tribune of 205. The error was repeated by Smith but corrected by Shuckburgh. Groebe, however, let it stand in the revised Drumann.

⁸ C. I. L., I², p. 146.

and makes it more likely that he was the brother, younger but not very young, of the praetor of 205, rather than his very young nephew. A probable conclusion is that Suetonius is correct about the number of generations from Rufus to Augustus, but places the military tribune one generation too late. Drumann and those who follow him give as the stemma of Augustus: Cn. Octavius Rufus (quaestor about 230), C. Octavius, C. Octavius (military tribune in 205), C. Octavius, C. Octavius (praetor in 61), Augustus. In place of this I suggest the following: Cn. Octavius Rufus (quaestor in 230), C. Octavius (military tribune in 205), C. Octavius, C. Octavius, C. Octavius (praetor in 61), Augustus. It is equally possible, however, that Suetonius has missed one generation entirely, and that we should add still another Octavius between the military tribune and the praetor.

RUSSEL M. GEER.

BROWN UNIVERSITY.

PINDAR'S FIGURATIVE USE OF PLANTS.

[A study of the figurative use of plants in the poems and fragments of Pindar shows that this poet was unusually fond of such figures, which he employed in great variety.]

Gildersleeve, in his excellent edition of Pindar's Olympian and Pythian Odes,¹ makes the following statement with regard to the word *κατεφυλλορόησε* (*Ol.* xii, 15): "The *τιμά* thus becomes a flower. It has been noticed that P. [= Pindar] draws few of his figures from the world of plants." He points this out in no other connection, and a statement appearing in the introductory essay under "Metaphor" may contradict it: "Every realm of nature, every sphere of human life, is laid under contribution."² In speaking of Pindar's elevation he has himself used a figure from the world of plants: "the fruits that grow on the topmost branches of the tree of virtue."³

A careful examination of the poems themselves will reveal the fact that Pindar is very fond of such figures. Gildersleeve seems to recognize this in at least one instance besides that quoted above. He translates the phrase: *χειρῶν ἄωτον Βλεψιάδαις ἐπίνικον* (*Ol.* viii, 75) by "the fruit of their victorious hands."⁴ In the extant poems, including the fragments published by Schroeder, there are no fewer than one hundred and five examples of the figurative use of words which connote plants, some part of them, or some act connected with them. Not only are they numerous, but they are also varied, and every conceivable idea associated with plants is represented.

There are ten examples of the use of the word for "seed" (*σπέρμα*) in the figurative sense: (1) *ὄθεν σπέρματος . . . τὸν Αἰνησιδάμον* (*Ol.* ii, 50 f.); (2) *αἰθοίσας ἔχοντες σπέρμ' ἀνέβαν φλογὸς οὗ* (*Ol.* vii, 48); (3) *σπέρμ' ἀπὸ Καλλιάνακτος* (*Ol.* vii, 93); (4) *ἔχεν δὲ σπέρμα μέγιστον ἄλοχος* (*Ol.* ix, 61); (5) *σπέρμα θεοῦ καθαρὸν* (*Py.* iii, 15); (6) *πῦρ ἐξ ἐνὸς σπέρματος* (*Py.* iii, 36 f.);

¹ New York, 1890².

² P. xlii. The citations from Pindar in this article are taken from Otto Schroeder's second Teubner edition (Leipzig, 1914) and his numbering is followed.

³ *Ibid.*, xxxix.

⁴ *Ad loc.*, p. 199. But see below, p. 344.

(7) ἄφθιτον . . . Διβίας εὐρυχόρου σπέρμα (*Py.* iv, 42 f.); (8) σπέρμ' . . . ὄλβου (*Py.* iv, 255); (9) σπέρμ' ἀδείμαντον φέρων Ἡρακλέος (*Nem.* x, 17); (10) σπέρμα θνατὸν (*Nem.* x, 81). In two other instances Pindar uses the cognate verb of sowing (σπείρω): (1) σπεῖρέ νυν ἀγλαΐαν τινὰ (*Nem.* i, 13); and (2) μομφὰν δ' ἐπισπείρων ἀλιτροῖς (*Nem.* viii, 39).

Four figures refer to the root (ρίζα): (1) ἔχοντα ρίζαν . . . τὸν Αἰνησιδάμου (*Ol.* ii, 50 f.); (2) ἀστέων ρίζαν (*Py.* iv, 15); (3) ρίζαν . . . θάλλουσαν (*Py.* ix, 8); (4) ρίζαν πρόφαινεν (*Isth.* viii, 55). Four others refer to leaves: (1) φυλλοφόρων ἀπ' ἀγώνων (*Ol.* viii, 76); (2) ἀκλεῆς τιμὰ κατεφυλλορόησε ποδῶν (*Ol.* xii, 15—this example is noted by Gildersleeve); (3) φύλλ' αἰοιδᾶν (*Isth.* iv, 27); (4) νεϊκέων πέταλα (*Isth.* viii, 43).

In seven instances the figure is taken from the young shoot (θάλος or ἔρνος): (1) Ἀδραστιδᾶν θάλος ἀρωγὸν δόμοις (*Ol.* ii, 49); (2) σεμνὸν θάλος Ἀλκαϊδᾶν (*Ol.* vi, 68); (3) κλεινᾶν Συρακοσσᾶν θάλος (*Nem.* i, 2); (4) ἔρνεσι Λατοῦς (*Nem.* vi, 37); (5) κοινὸν θάλος (*Isth.* vii, 24); (6) Λατοῦς ἱμεροέστατον ἔρνος (*Frag.* 87, 1); (7) ὦν θάλεσσιν ἐν κείμαι (*Frag.* *104d, 48).

The figures referring to flowers may be divided into two types: (a) those which contain the word flower (ἄνθος or ἄνθεμον), and (b) those which consist of the same root qualified by a prefix. Of type *a* there are six examples: (1) ἄνθεμα δὲ χρυσοῦ φλέγει (*Ol.* ii, 79); (2) ἐμῶν δ' ὕμνων . . . εὐτερπὲς ἄνθος (*Ol.* vi, 105)⁵; (3) ἄνθεα δ' ὕμνων νεωτέρων (*Ol.* ix, 48 f.); (4) ἄνθος ἦβας (*Py.* iv, 158); (5) τὰ τέρπν' ἄνθε' Ἀφροδίσια (*Nem.* vii, 53); (6) (σώ)φρονος ἄνθεσιν εὐνομίας (*Frag. of Paeon to Thebans*, 10). Of type *b* there are ten examples: (1) πρὸς εὐάνθεμον . . . φυάν (*Ol.* i, 67); (2) εὐανθῆς Μετώπα (*Ol.* vi, 84); (3) Ὀραι πολυάνθεμοι (*Ol.* xiii, 17); (4) εὐανθεῖ δ' ἐν ὀργᾷ παρμένων (*Py.* i, 89); (5) ὦτε φοινικανθέμον ἦρος ἀκμᾷ (*Py.* iv, 64); (6) οἰνάνθας ὀπώραν (*Nem.* v, 6b); (7) λευκανθέα σώμασι (*Nem.* ix, 23); (8) εὐανθεῖ σὺν ὄλβῳ (*Isth.* v, 12); (9) εὐανθέ' ἀπέπνευσας ἀλικίαν (*Isth.* vii, 34); (10) εὐανθῆς ἅπας τέθαλεν ὄλβος (*Frag.* 129, 5).

Pindar is very fond of the word ἄσπος which is frequently to be translated into English by the phrase "the finest flower."

⁵ J. B. Bury: *The Nemean Odes of Pindar* (London, 1890), pp. xii f., refers to the dominant idea of the flower in this passage and in the sixth Olympian as a whole.

The fundamental idea in the word seems to be, however, "the choicest" since it is used in Homer of wool (*Il.* xiii, 599 and 716; *Od.* i, 443), and of linen (*Il.* ix, 661); by Apollonius of Rhodes, it is used of the golden fleece (iv, 176), by Callimachus of water (*Hymn to Apollo*, 112), and of a wave (*Hecale*, i, 43), and by Simonides (148) of a rose. In Pindar it is used of music (*Ol.* i, 15), of fathers (*Ol.* ii, 8), of horses (*Ol.* iii, 3 f.), of hands (*Ol.* viii, 75), and of many other words, always in the sense of choicest, or as "the flower." The plant-idea is, however, inherent only in the English translation and does not belong to the Greek root. The expression "first-fruits" in *I Corinthians* (xv, 20) is not a translation of *ἄωτοι* but of *ἀπαρχή*.

Eleven examples refer to fruit (*καρπός*): (1) *καρπὸν Ἥβας* (*Ol.* vi, 58); (2) *γλυκὺν καρπὸν φρενός* (*Ol.* vii, 8); (3) *φρενῶν ἔλαχε καρπὸν ἀμώμητον* (*Py.* ii, 73 f.); (4) *Ἥβας καρπὸν* (*Py.* ix, 109 f.); (5) *κλυτοκάρπων οὐ νέοντ' ἄνευ στεφάνων* (*Nem.* iv, 76 f.); (6) *φρενῶν καρπὸν* (*Nem.* x, 12); (7) *ἐπέων δὲ καρπός* (*Isth.* viii, 45 f.); (8) *ἀγλαοκάρπους . . . Ὠρας* (*Frag. of hymn to Thebans*, 6); (9) *μαλθακᾶς ὥρας ἀπὸ καρπὸν δρέπεσθαι* (*Frag.* 122, 8); (10) *σοφίας καρπὸν δρέπ(ειν)* (*Frag.* 209); (11) *πραπίδων καρπὸν* (*Frag.* 211). Two examples of the figure of the fruit-season occur: (1) *οἰνάνθας ὀπώραν* (*Nem.* v, 6b); and (2) *Ἀφροδίτας . . . ὀπώραν* (*Isth.* ii, 4 f.). In only one instance does Pindar use the idea of grass in a figurative sense: *ἐκ λεχέων . . . μελιαδέα ποίαν* (*Py.* ix, 37).

In addition to the two cases of the use of the verb of sowing already noticed above, there are eleven instances of the verb of planting or causing to grow (*φυτεύω*): (1) *ἀστέων ρίζαν φυτεύσεσθαι* (*Py.* iv, 15); (2) *θεόπομποί σφισιν τιμαὶ φύτευθεν* (*Py.* iv, 69); (3) *ἄμμες αὖ κείνων φυτευθέντες* (*Py.* iv, 144); (4) *γένος Εὐφάμου φυτευθὲν* (*Py.* iv, 256); (5) *πατὴρ δὲ θυγατρὶ φυτεύων κλεινότερον γάμον* (*Py.* ix, 111 f.); (6) *φύτενέ οἱ θάνατον* (*Nem.* iv, 59); (7) *Ζηνὸς ἥρωας αἰχματὰς φυτευθέντας* (*Nem.* v, 7); (8) *Αἰακὸν νιν . . . φυτεύσαι* (*Nem.* vii, 84); (9) *φυτευθεὶς ὄλβος* (*Nem.* viii, 17); (10) *δαίμων φυτεύει δόξαν* (*Isth.* vi, 12); (11) *χάριν ἀοιδᾷ φυτεύει* (*Frag.* 141, 2).

The idea of growth is represented by Pindar's most developed simile taken from plants: *αὐξεται δ' ἀρετὰ, χλωραῖς ἐέρσαις ὥς ὅτε δένδρεον ᾄσσει* (*Nem.* viii, 40).

There are twenty-three examples of verbs with the idea of

blooming or flourishing (βλαστάνω or θάλλω or ἀνθέω): (1) βλάσ τε μὲν ἐξ ἀλὸς ὑγρᾶς νᾶσος (*Ol.* vii, 69 f.); (2) θάλλει δ' ἀρεταΐσιν (*Ol.* ix, 16); (3) ἐκ θεοῦ δ' ἀνὴρ σοφαῖς ἀνθεῖ πραπίδεσσιν ὁμοίως (*Ol.* xi, 10); (4) ἐν δ' Ἄρης ἀνθεῖ (*Ol.* xiii, 23); (5) ὦν κλέος ἀνθησεν αἰχμᾶς (*Py.* i, 66); (6) θάλλει . . . Ἀρκεσίλας (*Py.* iv, 65); (7) θάλλουσιν εὐδαιμονίαν (*Py.* vii, 21); (8) ῥίζαν . . . θάλλουσιν (*Py.* ix, 8); (9) Ἥβας καρπὸν ἀνθήσαντ' (*Py.* ix, 109 f.); (10) ἀγάνορα πλοῦτον ἀνθεῖν (*Py.* x, 18); (11) θαλερὰν Ἥβαν ἄκοιτιν (*Nem.* i, 71); (12) θάλησε Κορινθίους σελίνους (*Nem.* iv, 88); (13) ἐβλασεν δ' υἱὸς Οἰνῶνας (*Nem.* viii, 7); (14) ἄστν . . . θάλησεν (*Nem.* x, 41-42); (15) ὄλβος . . . θάλλων (*Isth.* iii, 5 f.); (16) Κλεωνυμίδαι θάλλοντες (*Isth.* iv, 4); (17) θάλλουσ' ἀρετὰ (*Isth.* v, 17); (18) θάλλοντος . . . συμποσίου (*Isth.* vi, 1); (19) χρυσέα κόμη θάλλων (*Isth.* vii, 49); (20) θάλλει μαλακαῖς ἐ(ὐ)δίαι(ς) (*Frag. of Paeon to Abderitans*, 52); (21) θάλλουσα . . . κᾶρα (*Frag.* *104d, 32); (22) εὐανθὴς ἅπας τέθαλεν ὄλβος (*Frag.* 129, 5); (23) ἐπεφνεθ θάλλοντας ἦβη (*Frag.* 171, 2).

There are ten examples of the figurative use of the idea of plucking or reaping (δρέπω or κείρω): (1) τιμὰν οἷαν οὔτις Ἑλλάνων δρέπει (*Py.* i, 49); (2) δραπὼν . . . ἱερὸν εὐζύας ἄωτον (*Py.* iv, 130 f.); (3) κείραι μελιαδέα ποίαν (*Py.* ix, 37); (4) Ἥβας καρπὸν ἀνθήσαντ' ἀποδρέψαι (*Py.* ix, 109 f.); (5) δρέπεσθαι κάλιστον ἄωτον . . . νικᾶν (*Nem.* ii, 9); (6) τᾶν τ' ἐαριδρόπων αἰοιδᾶν (*Frag.* 75, 6); (7) μαλθακᾶς ὥρας ἀπὸ καρπὸν δρέπεσθαι (*Frag.* 122, 8); (8) ἐρώτων δρέπεσθαι (*Frag.* 123, 1); (9) δραπόντες . . . λυσίπονον τελετάν (*Frag.* 131, 1); (10) σοφίας καρπὸν δρέπ(ειν) (*Frag.* 209).

Three examples belong to a final group: παῖδα ἰόπλοκον Εὐάδναν (*Ol.* vi, 30); (2) ἰοπλοκάμων . . . Μοισᾶν (*Py.* i, 1); (3) ἰοπλόκοισι Μοίσαις (*Isth.* vii, 23). There is some doubt as to whether Evadne and the Muses are to be regarded as having violet-coloured hair (whatever that colour may be) or as having violets in their hair. The weight of probability, however, is in favour of the former inasmuch as Bacchylides (viii [ix], 3) refers to the Muses as ἰοβλεφάρων. The eyes are not susceptible of the latter interpretation, and it is therefore probable that ἰοπλόκαμος means hair of violet hue.

It will be noticed that these figures are well distributed throughout the odes and are not confined to any group. Only nine of the forty-five epinician odes have none: *Ol.* iv, x, xiv;

Py. v, vi, viii, xi, xii, and *Nem.* xi. The earliest of these odes⁶ was written in 490 B. C. and the latest in 446 B. C. (?), from which facts it is evident that Pindar's use of these figures is not confined to any period of his artistic development.

Farnell's translation in several instances uses figures from plants where Pindar's original has no such idea: (1) ὦν ἔραται καιρὸν διδούς (*Py.* i, 57) = "giving him the fair harvest of all his heart's desire"; (2) ὕμνον . . . τὸν ἐδέξαντ' ἀμφ' ἀρετῇ (*Py.* i, 79 f.) = "The praise that they have reaped"; (3) Ὁ πονήσας δὲ νόψ καὶ προμάθειαν φέρει (*Isth.* i, 40) = "The mind reapeth prudence as the fruit of trouble past"; (4) οἶδεν δὲ διόσδοτον ἀρχάν (*Frag.* 137) = "And he knoweth that its first seeds were of God's giving"; (5) στάσιν ἀπὸ πραπίδος ἐπικότον ἀνελών (*Frag.* 109) = "Let him uproot from his own breast the wrathful faction spirit." Such changes in no sense mar the excellence of his translation which comes nearest of any translation to rendering the full beauty of Pindar's lines in English. Sandys⁷ occasionally fails to preserve the plant figure which the original words of Pindar give, as, for example, βλάσσε . . . νᾶσος (*Ol.* vii, 70) = ". . . arose an island . . ."

In the fragments of Bacchylides likewise are to be found figures from plants. There are twenty-two examples which may be classified under the same headings as the figures in Pindar:⁸ (1) φέρων [εὐδ]αιμονίας πέταλον (v, 185 f.); (2) ἡ βροτῶν τοιοῦτον ἔρνος θρέψεν (v, 87); (3) ὄλβον κάλλιστ' . . . ἄνθεα (iii, 92-94); (4) Νίκας . . . ἄνθεα (xii, 60); (5) παιγόνων ἄνθεα (xv, 8 f.); (6) ἀοιδᾶν ἄνθεα (*Frag.* 4, 2); (7) ἐν κυανανθεί . . . πόντῳ (xii, 124); (8) ἄκαρπον ἔχει πόνον (*Frag.* 11, 6); (9) σὲ . . . φύτευσεν Αἰθρα (xvi, 58 f.); (10) ἡ Πιερίδες φύτευ[σαν . . .] καδέων ἀνάπανσ[ιν] (xviii, 35 f.); (11) Κάδμος Σεμέλ[αν φύτευσεν] (xviii,

⁶ According to the dating adopted by L. R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar, translated, with literary and critical commentaries* (London, 1930), vol. I, translation and commentaries. There is doubt as to the date of *Py.* viii. See Gildersleeve's introduction to the ode, p. 324 f.

⁷ J. E. Sandys, *The Odes of Pindar* (Loeb Classical Library), London and New York, 1924.

⁸ Citations from Bacchylides are taken from the fourth edition by Blass and Suess in the Teubner series (Leipzig, 1912); those from Simonides are from E. Diehl's Teubner edition of the *Anthologia Lyrica* (Leipzig, 1924).

48); (12) Ἀρετὰ γὰρ ἐπανεομένα δένδρον ὥς ἀέξεται (*Frag.* *37B) closely paralleling the simile of Pindar (*Nem.* viii, 40); (13) θάλειαν αὖτις ἀγκομίσσαι ἦβαν (iii, 89 f.); (14) τόθεν γὰρ[ρ] πυθμένες θάλλουσιν ἐσθλ[ῶν] (v, 197-199); (15) ἐλπίδι χρυσέαι τέθαλεν (ix [x], 40); (16) θάλλει . . . Νίκας . . . ἄνθεα (xii [xiii], 58-60); (17) θάλλουσ' ἀθαμβῆς ὕβρις (xiv, 58-59); (18) [ιοπλό]κων . . . Μουσᾶν (iii, 71); (19) Μουσᾶν γε (f)ιοβλεφάρων (viii [ix], 3); (20) ἰόπλοκον . . . [μ]ατ[έρ] (viii [ix], 72); (21) ἰόπλοκοι . . . Νηρηΐδες (xvi, 37); (22) ἰοβλέφαροι . . . χάριτες (xviii, 5 f.).

The fragments of Simonides yield but a small harvest of these figures: (1) ἄνθος ἀοιδῶν (*Frag.* 127); (2) ὄφρα τις ἄνθος ἔχη πολυήρατον ἦβης (*Frag.* 97, 6); (3) ἰοπλοκάμων . . . θυγατρῶν (*Frag.* 30, 3), and one fragment included by J. M. Edmonds:⁹

“Οἷη περ φύλλων γενεή, τοιγάρ καὶ ἀνδρῶν.”

The number of lines of Bacchylides and Simonides is not sufficient in either case to enable us to make any valuable comparison of these poets with Pindar, but it is certain that Pindar uses many and varied figures from plants, and it is probable that such figures were very common in all the epinician poets.

GEORGE MCCrackEN.

SUSQUEHANNA UNIVERSITY.

⁹ *Lyra Graeca* (Loeb Classical Library), London and New York, 1924, vol. II, p. 338, frag. 97. This fragment is preserved in Stobaeus, *Florilegium*, 98, 29, but is omitted by Diehl.

THE USE OF GREEK WORDS BY PLAUTUS.

[An analysis of the scenes and situations in which Greek words appear shows that in some plays they are well scattered with apparently little purpose, whereas in others they are highly concentrated where the action is inorganic or dull, especially in monologues and in the mouths of slaves. When the plays are arranged in sequence according to the increasing skill in the distribution of Greek words, this sequence will be seen to agree markedly with most conjectures of the chronology of the plays. It is therefore concluded that an important feature in the development of Plautus' style was an increasing ability to use Greek words and words of foreign flavor as a rhetorical embellishment to his art.]

The fact that the only two plays of Plautus containing more than a single word or phrase of pure Greek, the *Pseudolus* and the *Trinummus*, can both be reasonably dated in the later years of Plautus' activity,¹ suggests that an investigation of the Greek words and words of Greek flavor might reveal corroborative evidence for the chronology of the plays. A simple counting, however, of words selected for that purpose yields percentages some of which conflict with the few known or soundly deduced dates.² The averages obtained, however, show a wide variation in the ratio of Greek words to the number of lines in the play (1:15½ to 1:37); further investigation, therefore, is warranted. An inquiry into the situations and conversations in which these words occur yielded the results recorded in this paper. There is a clear relationship between the distribution of these words and the chronological sequence of the plays; Plautus' artistry in using them developed with his years.

Many studies have been made on Greek words in Latin, and in Plautus in particular.³ These, however, treat only the words,

¹ *Pseudolus*, 191 B. C. by didascalie notice; *Trinummus*, after 194 B. C. Cf. M. Schanz-C. Hosius, *Geschichte der Röm. Lit.* (I. Müller, *Handb. d. klass. Alter.*, 4th ed., 1927), p. 72 and T. Frank, *A. J. P.*, LIII (1932), p. 156. The definite date, 187 B. C. is suggested in the latter article.

² The *Stichus* (200 B. C.) has a higher percentage than the late *Pseud.* and *Trin.* The *Casina*, usually accepted as late, has the third lowest average. The early *Poenulus* and *Miles* stand twelfth and thirteenth respectively in the list from lowest to highest.

³ O. Goerke, *Symbola ad vocabula Graeca in linguam Lat. recepta*, diss., Regimonti Pr., 1868. N. Tuchhaendler, *De vocabulis Graecis in*

their forms, meaning, and derivation. The indices of Greek words in all of these works differ little from each other. Bostroem alone attempts to discover *reasons* for the use of Greek, attributing all words either to "Graecam fabularum naturam", "versum", or "ioci causa", but by far the greatest number to "linguae Latinae egestatem" (p. 3). It is true that "egestas" accounts for such words as *tragoedia*, *triobolus*, *petasus*, *halophanta* and others, but it is apparent that this same "egestas" has been invoked in behalf of many words which have Latin synonyms used elsewhere by Plautus (e. g., *eleutheria*, *libertas*; *architecton*, *faber*). "Graecam fabularum naturam", moreover, can apply only to particular episodes or topics of Greek nature, not to the plays as a whole. Else, since everything in Plautus (except a few definitely Roman references) is Greek in nature and yet the Greek words are relatively few, there would be no limit to this class. Nor do I believe that "versum" can be held responsible for Graecisms; is a poet worth the name who resorts to a Greek word simply because the Latin will not fit the meter (*strategus*, *Stich.* 702-705; why not *dux* or *magister*, the master of the feast?)? There is clearly some other motivation for these words. The class, "ioci causa", however, is far more accurately chosen. It should, I believe, include all words not soundly placed in the small groups "egestas" and "Graecam fabularum naturam".

Kahle's work is morphological: his interest is to determine which words had been "in sermonem Latinum vere recepta". He therefore lists as Greek only those which cannot be shown to have been communicated to Rome before Plautus' time, those which have not undergone change in form, those which have not taken Latin inflexions inconsistent with the Greek form (*symbolus* but not *symbola*), or those not bearing Latin suffixes and prefixes which show with what familiarity the Romans used them (*subbasilicanos*, *cistellula*). These Greek words, especially

ling. Lat. translatis, diss., Berol., 1876. H. Rassow, "De Plauti substantivis," *Jahrb. f. kl. Phil.*, Suppl. Bd. XII (1881), pp. 591 ff. O. Weise, *Die Griechischen Wörter im Latein*, Leipzig, 1882. K. Himer, *Rechka slova v palliatach Plautovykh*, Prag, 1895. E. Bostroem, *De vocab. Graecis apud Plautum*, diss., New York, 1902. W. Kahle, *De vocab. Graecis Plauti aetate in sermonem Latinum vere receptis*, diss., Westfal., 1918.

if they have no Latin synonyms or designate things he does not believe familiar to the Romans, are marked "vocabula peregrina", 114 in number, including some compounds whose admission is strange⁴ (*parasitatio*, *supparasitor*, *sycophantor*). His reasoning is often not cogent (*parasitatio*, *syllaba*) and omissions are numerous (*eleutheria*, *apalus*, *ictis*, *campe*, and many others).

The lists of Tuchhaendler, Rassow, Himer, and Bostroem are more useful since my purpose is to use words not only Greek in themselves, but all which to the Roman ear may have had a Greek flavor. Since, in so subjective and intangible a problem, there is no sure criterion on which to base a choice, the following discussion of foreign words in English will explain why my index agrees more closely with the liberal selection of those of the four scholars above mentioned than with that of Kahle.

Some words brought into English have lost all their foreign flavor, especially those in the commonest daily use (*garage*, *hangar*, *chef*, *chaperon*). Yet even daily use does not always cause the loss of this flavor (*deluxe*, *garçon*, *tête-à-tête*, *rendezvous*, *au revoir*, and many expressions even when atrociously spelled, *parleyvoo* and *savvy*). These are the common property of all Americans; many more, used by cultured people, are readily understood if not habitually used by those less versed in languages (*bon-bon*, *portmanteau*, *coiffeur*, *bravo*, *braggadocio*, *siesta*). These, if used by the mass of the people, imply an amusing elegance or an assumption of airs; *milliner*, for example, though all connection with Milan is lost, is more elegant than *hat shop*; similarly *modiste*, *lavalère*, *lingerie* have an air of exquisiteness over their prosaic synonyms. So on up the scale to such definitely foreign words as *cortège*, *impasse*, *empressement*, and phrases as *idée fixe*, *au courant*, *au grand sérieux*, still printed in italics.⁵

⁴ Others are evidently included because the Greek suffix is identical with the Latin: *-ikos*, *-icus* and *-ίω*, *-isso*.

⁵ If appeal is made to "egestas" of the English language, it may be observed that even words for which we have no equivalent have not lost their foreign flavor (*trousseau*, *layette*, *gamin*, *consommé*, *foyer*, *liaison*, *Sachlichkeit*); no one of these words, if used accurately, can be expressed in English by less than two words. More often a whole sentence is necessary.

The foreign air of a word common in English may degenerate into mere elegance or posing, yet the air remains. Therefore, since the "egestas" of Latin could have been avoided, and since the "Graeca fabularum natura" has been shown to be too broad a term, I believe that Plautus used Greek primarily "ioci causa et elegantiae."⁶

I have considered, then, all words bearing a reasonably close resemblance to the Greek. All the indices (save that of Kahle), as well as my own lists, agree closely with those words marked as Greek (†) in Harper's Dictionary, except that Harper's does not mark strictly Latin formations on Greek words. Such words, it will be observed, have only been used when they appear in conjunction with other words of clearer Greek flavor. Others, not marked with †, but clearly Greek according to the etymologies in Harper's (by the use of the notation =) and in Walde's *Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, have been similarly used. Some words, omitted by Kahle, but expressed in Harper's by † or =, can hardly, from their extreme morphological change or from their frequency throughout the plays, be regarded as adding to the Greek flavor of a particular passage.⁷ Such words seem to me to belong to the *garage*, *chaperon* variety. A few words requiring special discussion will be referred to in the notes in their proper places. Words denoting foods, oils, perfumes, and so forth, though usually identical in both languages and common to the Roman, nevertheless must have suggested to the Roman of Plautus' day the luxury and elegance of Greek life and have hence been used as Greek coloring in this study; they probably stood in much the same relation to the Romans as does a moderately Gallicized menu to us. Similarly, Greek sporting terms

⁶ Another means of elegant posing in English, by no means uncommon in Plautus, is word-coining (*lubritorium*) and artificial archaizing (*Ye Olde Sandwiche Shoppe*).

⁷ E. g., *epistula*, *fidicina*, *hilarus*, *latro*, *mina*, *nummus*, *obsonor*, *parasitus*, *Philippus*, *purpura*, *rosa*, *talentum*, *vinum*, *violarius*. Though the Romans were doubtless familiar with the Greek monetary system, I have retained *tetradrachma* as a Greek word because of the *terpa*-prefix. The simple word *drachma* appears only three times, and has little importance whether counted or not, but *drachumisso* (-ἰσω) must be retained. A few other purely Greek words must be eliminated because of their common bearing on the plays themselves, e. g., *tragoedia*, *comoedia*.

suggested types of exercises generally alien to the Romans; cricket and rugby terms may serve as a modern parallel. Finally, it must always be borne in mind that even a word which we may think of as having been very common to the Roman may, by a slight change of pronunciation, have suggested a Greek flavor; the two pronunciations of *valet*, *coupe*, or *sabotage*, suggest how simply a change of effect may be produced.

The subjectivity of my choice of words cannot be denied since it is impossible in any way to determine accurately what proportion of the audience might be familiar with this or that word. In all probability one would understand where another might not.⁸ However, by making my choice as wide as possible (since the words therefore appear *passim* in many different situations) the following analyses of the plays have been made the more sound inasmuch as it is the concentration of these terms in small parts of plays which will be seen to be the determining factor in the conclusion. These analyses will show into which of three hypothetical groups each play falls: I, those in which the Greek words are well scattered throughout the play and used with no apparent purpose; II, those in which a definite tendency toward concentration and artistic use appears; and III, those in which the words are clearly concentrated and distributed with an artistic purpose.

Six Greek words appear in the prologue to the *Amphitruo*. Four more occur in 1011-1012 (and *eugepae* in 1018) a speech dealing with various shops in which Amphitruo searched for Naucrates. Eight of these ten are Greek even according to Kahle; others in the play marked by him as Greek are *mastigia* in a fragment, *eugae* in a tensely dramatic situation after the

⁸ There is no doubt that within the lifetime of Plautus the Romans learned more and more Greek. One has but to review the dates of the Punic and Macedonian wars to realize this. It is also an undoubted fact that most of the Greek used by Plautus is of the type which could well be picked up by soldiers fighting on foreign soil (Cf. T. Frank, *Life and Literature in the Roman Republic*, pp. 169 ff.). But the familiarity which we assume the soldiers had with these words does not prove that they had lost all their Greek flavor. Words learned by American soldiers in France during 1917-1918 may have a place in our dictionaries and in our speech and still not sound as ordinary English to us. Words may be familiar and still be foreign.

startling *accubuisti* (802), and *apage* (310, 579) less artistically conceived. The most amusing scene (Sosia and Mercury, 153-462) is embellished only with *apage* when the two first meet, and *attat*, 263, well placed at the beginning of the fray. Similarly 883-955, in which Jupiter tries to straighten himself with Alcmena, needs and has no Greek ornament. These comprise most of the concentration, or lack thereof, for the number of Greek words in this play is very small. This may be due, in part at least, to the unique fact that the play derives its amusement from mythological travesty rather than from more usual Plautine methods. The definite tendency toward concentration in this play places it clearly in Group II.

The *Asinaria* has but nine words listed by Kahle as Greek, of which one, *syngraphus*, appears three times and is really a part of the plot. The others, *aer*,⁹ *gymnasium*, *naulericus*, *propino*, *poema*, *scyphos*, *sycophantia*, are well scattered, and are not supported by other words of foreign feeling. One Greek word, with a Latin inflection, is used, *badizas*, 706, familiar to Roman soldiers from the earliest days of warfare with Greek-speaking peoples. Libanus uses the word in contrast to *tolutim* and directly after *incedis*, for variety and comic effect in a farcical scene. No concentration can be noted beyond the loving names which Libanus imposes upon his helpless master, where *columbam* and *monerulam*, though combined with other Latin epithets, definitely suggest Grecian daintiness, 693. Those scenes in which the intrigue is planned, 266-380, and the trader disposed of, 402-504, show slight diminution of Greek coloring, for the interest precludes the need of such embellishment, except a few lofty sounding business terms by the posing Leonida. These two scenes only, however, cannot counteract the absence of designed distribution elsewhere. The *Asinaria* then falls into Group I.

The *Aulularia* has two passages of prime importance. 508-522 is the conclusion of a long and unembellished discourse on feminine economies, but when at the end the subject suddenly changes to feminine luxury and extravagance, it is highly sig-

⁹ Used in a Greek proverb, 99. So too in Enn., *Ann.*, 148. Cf. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtl. Redensarten d. Römer*, Leipzig, 1890, p. 364.

nificant that eleven Greek words are introduced, e. g., *molo-chinarius*, *murobatharii*, *stropharii*, *zonarii*, *t(p?)hylacistae*, *corcotarii*. The other is a long passage dealing chiefly with food and feasts, wherefore we are not surprised to find in 280-460 fourteen words, some culinary, some (*gymnasium*, *cinaedus*) of other color. *Eugae* (*bis*, 677) is excellently placed in the mouth of Strobilus at the exciting moment that he sees Euclio hiding the gold. *Harpago*, *zamia*, and *polypus*, though all within five lines (197-201) are less carefully placed. *Dica*, 760, is the only foreign word in the amusing conversation at cross purposes, 731-807. No Greek appears in the serious conversation between Megaronides and Euclio, 537-586. The remaining words, less than twelve, are scattered *passim* and in fragments. The absence of Greek words in serious discussions between *senes*, and in scenes in which the amusement is dependent upon an anomalous situation is noteworthy. The dependence of the entire play upon misunderstandings and humorous delineation of character rather than on clever dialogue is responsible probably for the extreme paucity of Greek words, although the careful disposition of the few employed places the *Aulularia* very close to Group III.

The *Bacchides* has over forty words of Greek flavor, and their concentration is high. Pistoclerus, 65-73, compares the healthy military life to that of the debauchee, using nine different Greek words, some of which suggest the foppishness of the Greeks (*cantharum*, *scaphium*, *malacum*) to which Bacchis adds *mala-cissandus es*. In the same scene we find *Bacchas bacchanal*, 53, emphasis on various forms of *opsonium*, 96-97. Throughout the next sixty lines the conversation is of a more serious nature, but, with the appearance of the slave Chrysalus, 170, Greek flavor, especially plays on words, becomes prominent, but only in his mouth (note especially the three doublets within sixteen lines, 232-248); Greek words continue frequently until line 367. The careful expository interlude, 368-404, is markedly free from any Greek, but when Lydus emphasizes the value of exercise, 419 ff., the concentration is extremely noticeable: six Greek words, three of them used here only, color his speech. Throughout the central portion of the play, where the complicated double plot well holds the interest, no Greek is necessary and little appears,

525-979.¹⁰ Nor does the balance of the play hold much, save *eugae* dramatically placed in 991 and again in 1105 following *fungi*, *bardi*, *blenni*. Of 79 foreign words 62 fall previous to line 525; of the balance we have already noted six; of the remaining eleven ten are spoken by Chrysalus, and usually finely used (note especially 725). The concentration and artistry in the *Bacchides* place it without question in Group III.

Among the well scattered words in the *Captivi* a few indications of purposeful arrangement are clear. The long monodies of Ergasilus the parasite carry more than one-eighth of the entire number of words of Greek flavor, though they occupy less than one-tenth of the play. His part in dialogues adds nine more words (795-796 on war and 850-851 on food) in addition to the Greek oaths by Latin place names (880-883). In the serious dialogue between Hegio and Tyndarus posing as a free man (250-449) there are only the business terms *trapezita* and *syngraphus*, though the asides of the freeborn Philoxenus, posing as a slave, are made to suit his assumed position: *philosophor* 284 and *eugae* 274. So too in the most rapidly moving scene in the play, 532-655, only five words are used. In addition to these there are some thirty-five words well scattered, including eleven of Kahle's list. It is clear that the *Captivi* falls fairly into Group II.

The words in the *Casina*, though few, are arranged with a purpose. The rapid action, 1-436, shows extraordinarily few scattered words. In the next scene the artificiality, not elsewhere practised by Plautus, of keeping an eavesdropper hidden for a whole scene is relieved by a very dramatic *attatae* (468), a series of Greek words relating to food as well as Latin ones, all cleverly parodied by Chalinus, and by the uniform high color of the latter's necessarily brief asides. All the Greek words except one are spoken by this slave. From 515 to 719 the plot assumes a renewed activity; an occasional expletive suffices for Greek coloring. Here, however, a cook enters and with him an abrupt change in tone. The action, standing still, gives way to

¹⁰ This includes the so-called Troy-monody of Chrysalus in which the Greek coloring is so well infused by proper names that only *lembus*, 958, is used.

comic effect produced by dialogue including *heia, attat, barbarico bliteo*, and the highly important passage, 728-730:

OL. . . . *enim vero πράγματά μοι παρέχεις.*

LY. *dabo tibi μέγα κακόν, ut ego opinor, nisi resistis.* OL. ὦ Ζεῦ.

The first phrase is little more than an elaborate reference to *ennui*, whereas the second could be no mystery less than sixty years after the death of Callimachus. After the last Greek words in this scene (748), the action again becomes organic and holds the interest by this means. No Greek appears until 796, the bridal procession, wherein the foreign flavor is almost overwhelming. There follows an interval of more solid Latinity, and then the final scenes of vituperation and disgrace again colored highly (*baccha, moechisso, nautea, babae, papae*). The *Casina* is surpassed by few plays in the artistry of disposition, and unquestionably falls into Group III.

The Greek words scattered through the mutilated scenes of the *Cistellaria* show no concentration. The evidence, unsatisfactory as it is, points toward Group I.

The *Curculio* has three clearly concentrated passages: the drunken Leaena's eulogy of wine with *euax* and a list which must have sounded like a French menu (96-102); Curculio's entrance with the typical foreign airs of a parasite's monologue (cf. especially 285-286 for Greek official titles, and 290-292); the unparalleled artificiality of the appearance of the *choragus* is justified by the humorous allusions to Roman topography after a definitely Greek touch at the opening (*halophantam an sycophantam*, the more noticeable for its rhyming swing). But these passages comprise less than half of over 40 Greek words; the others, too, are well concentrated. The opening expository scene is free from foreign words (cf. the similar scene in the *Pseudolus*) until the conversation turns to wine (75-90) and introduces Leaena. The parasite's military manner and discussion of war, embellished here and there (394-424), enlivens a business conversation which otherwise would not suffer from curtailment. Lines 487-555, developing the plot, have no Graecisms, but the arrival of the *miles* introduces many military terms (557-590). The anagnorisis and denouement show Greek influence only occasionally (611, 632 military again and *trapezita, passim*). Less than half a dozen other words are scat-

tered through the play (202, 220, 239, 359). The play falls clearly into Group III.¹¹

The *Epidicus* offers no such clear lines of demarcation. There are but two passages of note: 230-233, a playful repartee on dress involving many words reminiscent of Paris shops, and *basilice, gerrae, exoticum*; a passage closely resembling *Amph.* 1011-1012 in thought and expression. This passage is important, not for the mere two words involved (*gymnasium, myropola*) but because in similar circumstances the *Amphitruo* contains six. This is highly suggestive and will be commented upon later. In the remainder of the play the only significant scenes are IV, 1 and 2 holding the main threads of the plot, which have no embellishment. Elsewhere there are a few well conceived Graecisms (356, 457, 493), and effects by Epidicus (*pugilice atque athletice*, 20 and *apolactizo*, 678). Many other words are scattered throughout the play¹² the placing of which in Group I is prevented only by the two passages discussed above. It falls, perhaps, between Groups I and II.

The grouping of three Greek topographical verbs in two lines of the *Menaechmi* (11-12) is no index to the rest of the play. The absence of Greek in the monologues of the parasite (cf. *Captivi*) is in significant opposition to the practice in the *Curculio* (Group III). On the other hand we find some slight conformance to the principles we have seen developing in that the final hundred lines, entirely devoted to the anagnorisis, are singularly free from Greek coloring. Beyond these few notations, however, the *Menaechmi* affords a good example of the scattered and artless use of Greek, for, in spite of having an extremely self-sufficient plot, it has an average number of Greek words. It certainly falls then, near, if not in, Group I.

¹¹ It must be remembered that the large proportion of Greek words in the *Curculio* (the highest of all) does not necessarily link this play with the *Stichus* (the next highest) in time. The words in the latter play are well scattered, and the play falls between Groups I and II. It may be conjectured that since both these plays have plots among the weakest in the entire Plautine corpus, the large number of Graecisms may have been deliberate efforts to enliven a feeble play, well done in one case, poorly in the other.

¹² Note especially the remarkable frequency of the otherwise rare word *exentero*. Cf. F. W. Hall, *C. Q.*, XX (1926), p. 2 for a discussion and bibliography of Plautus' linguistic "obsessions."

The *Mercator* has few Greek words, and of these it is difficult to discern any careful disposition. A slight lowering of the percentage of Greek may be observed in 272-468 and 800-900, wherein the main interests are plot and Eutychus' dramatic intention to depart. Perhaps in the latter passage the amusement was more dependent upon the ridiculous melodrama.¹³ These negative indications are not supported by any noticeable concentration. The *Mercator* falls therefore in Group I.

Neither are the large number of Greek words in the *Miles Gloriosus*, only commensurate with its length, concentrated. Only a few passages suggest apt use of Greek. Periplectomenos' comment upon the attitudinizing Palaestrio (*eugae, euscheme hercle astitit et dulice et comoedice*, 213) adds color to the reference to Naevius (211) as a *poeta barbarus*. The slightly lower proportion of Greek in 370-595, where the interest is held by duping Sceledrus, is balanced by the appearance of the only real Greek, a pun on the name Dicaea (438). Two scenes, 991-1093 and 1216-1281, in which the interest depends upon imposture, have little Greek flavor, whereas the intervening section of non-essential discussion contains more than its share. But these few scenes in a very long play do not even show the degree of concentration we have noted in other plays, and, with the generous scattering of Greek elsewhere, it is without hesitation that the *Miles* is placed in Group I.

The *Mostellaria* betrays considerable evidence of careful distribution. The exposition (1-83) has only two words; the monody of Philolaches is wholly Roman even to the use of *faber* where *architectus* or *architecton* might occasion no surprise (cf. *Miles*, 919, *fabri architectique*). The toilet scene contains nine words including three different forms of *purpura*; this embellishment is in keeping with the subjects discussed, and the expletives are spoken, properly enough, by Philolaches. Tranio, beginning the intrigue, 348-407, reduces, as expected, the Greek coloring; there are only the amusing hybrid compounds (356). This restraint is maintained through the development of the intrigue to 531, and to a lesser degree to 698. Examples of finely conceived expletives throughout these sec-

¹³ Such as the parody of tragedy suggested by T. Frank, *A. J. P.*, LIII (1932), pp. 243 ff.

tions are found in 585 f., 638, 686. When Theopropides looks over Simo's house (690-858) we find little beyond a few foreign architectural terms (756 ff.); the situation carries the interest. The action continues rapidly colored here and there (875, 931, 952, 973, 981 f.). Though not carefully concentrated these passages contrast sharply with the remainder of the play in which the denouement claims the interest, and Greek coloring fades even more. The *Mostellaria* shows Plautus' artistry half developed, falling clearly in Group II.¹⁴

The *Persa* exemplifies exceedingly careful distribution. The exposition shows only a pompous reference to the pleasures of love, concluding, fittingly, with *basilice*, *agito*, *eleutheria* (29) and the highly affected *morologus* (49). The first mass of foreign words is reserved for the parasite (cf. especially 81-167). Here the action is slow and the conversation turns to the usual parasite's subject; *collyrae*, *collyricum*, *colyphia*, *cynicus*, *causia*, *chlamys*, *eu*, *πρόθεν*, represent eight of Kahle's words of which there are eighteen in the play. Next, the maledictions of Sophoclidisca and Paegnium are sufficiently virulent in Latin (cf. only *eia beia* and *tippula*). Plot now takes precedence and the Greek almost disappears (cf. a fine usage in 306). Saturio's artfully introduced Greek humor (389-396) ends a truly dramatic scene. After an interval of more Roman vituperation (406-426) and artistically placed in a pause before the main deception is Toxilus' elaborate admiration of the girl's disguise, 462 (*eugae*, *eugae*, *basilice*, *tiara*, *schema*, *graphice*, and Sagaristio's reply *tragici et comici*). This is concentration indeed. The few words scattered through the main deception are also generally well placed (interjection in 557 and 668, hybrid names in 702-706). Finally, in the revels of the last hundred lines deep foreign coloring returns, undoubtedly contributing to the orgiastic effect; *cyathos* (three times), *cantharos* (twice), *cinædus*, *babae*, *pausa*, *colaphos*, aided by *machina* and *basilice*, form an overwhelming average for a hundred lines. The *Persa* without question falls into Group III.

¹⁴ The play has a normal percentage of Greek words, but a very low percentage of Kahle's "vocabula peregrina",—a fact which may be attributed in part to the unique personality of Tranio upon whose deceptions the interest is centered even more than is usual in Plautus.

There is little concentration to be noted in the *Poenulus*. The words are scattered throughout, including one phrase of Greek (137). No short passage except 1310-1313 where names of foods are employed in malediction, appears to have been colored with Greek purposely. Of longer passages there are two in which Greek flavor is conspicuously absent; neither, however, is evidence of artful purpose: the long prologue and the Punic passage (930-1170). The *Poenulus* clearly falls in Group I.

The *Pseudolus* has the largest number of Greek words (70), even of Kahle's list (26); it contains six passages in which actual Greek is used. Of the other plays only the *Trinummus* has more than one. I, 1, the exposition, contains only a few colorless terms (cf. the *Curc.*). The blustering Ballio, I, 2, however, ornaments his tirade with insults and dainty Graecisms according to suitability (*plagis, excetra*,¹⁵ *flagitribae, harpaga, plagigera, peristromata, tappetia, culleis, δύναν*), thus adding to the bullying effect. In I, 3, where the plot takes precedence, little Greek is used, but when the conversation lapses into the essentially amusing and inorganic, the Greek effect is not lost (*inanilogistae* 255, *eugae* 323, *babae* and *bombax*, 365, add color when Latin curses have been exhausted). In the long dull I, 5 only the last forty lines are enlivened by promises of amazing tricks. The earlier part is highly embellished with Greek (*dictator Athenis Atticis, ὦ Ζεῦ, basilicum*, references to Socrates and Delphi, repeated variations of *ναὶ γάρ*, and even Simo's anticipation of the last reply, 415-520). The boasting of II, 1 and the imposition on Harpax are amusing enough in themselves, and show only a few military terms and puns on Ballio and Harpax in Greek (the latter repeated in 1010). *Pseudolus'* triumphant monody immediately following is avowedly (*iam satis est philosophatum, aurichalco, eugae*, 686-692) in a Greek tone. Lines 694-715, before the serious plotting begins, are especially rich in Greek: *mortalis graphicus, ἐπετής, io io te te tyranne, paratragoedat, eugae iam χάριν τούτῳ ποιῶ* (*Pseudolus'* third pun on names). But when plotting is undertaken at 716, the only Greek color noticeable is in a few military terms (necessary to the plot) and an imitation of slave talk, 741-743. This is one

¹⁵ Etym.? Cf. Walde, *op. cit.*, s. v., "weder *ἐχιδνα* + *ἐξεδρα* noch ex (aus *ἐχis*) + *cetra*, noch, *ἐκ-σκυθρα*."

of the most artistically written scenes in Plautus. The cook interlude is less Greek than one might expect, perhaps because there is more genuine humor (except six food names in 814-836). The plot is dominant until Pseudolus' drunken appearance (1246) where Greek words are again frequent. The final scene, brimming with other entertainment, needs no further adornment. The *Pseudolus*, known to have been produced in 191 B. C., clearly shows extremely artful distribution, and therefore falls into Group III.

In the *Rudens* two passages, with fifteen¹⁶ of the sixty words in the play, are prominent: the *piscatores*' song (290-305) and the description of the contents of the *vidulus* (1313-1320). A dash of Greek color is lent to the description of the shipwreck by Sceparnio (163-170). The scenes between the girls and the priestess have nothing. After the fishermen's song, II, 2-7 are liberally scattered with Greek (15 words), though with little significance or concentration. The action of this static play occurs in 615-892, wherein scattered words may be found; the greatest concentration is in the outbursts of Trachalio (630-633). Gripus' long quarrel with Trachalio has only (1003-1014) five words and a reference to Thales, *mastigia* 1022, and *eugae* 1037. Later interests (the judgment, anagnorisis, *licet* and *censeo* scenes) do not fill completely the remaining four hundred lines. Lines 1281-1423 are a lame ending which three occurrences of *triobolus* do little to enliven. The *Rudens*, showing evidences of moderate concentration, falls into Group II.

The *Stichus*, like the *Persa*, has an extremely high percentage of Greek words, both of Kahle's "vocabula peregrina" and of my indices. This connection with the *Persa* is significant since slaves have large parts in both plays. Two passages only, however, betray concentration in brief compass: 376-381, a discussion by parasite and *puer* of dainties, and the slave banquet, especially 702-707 where drinking terms are numerous.¹⁷ Although these scenes contain about one-third of the Greek words in less than one-fifth of the play, the remaining words are well

¹⁶ Counting either *tetrachuma* (1314) read by Sonnenschein, *minaria* by Lindsay and Leo, or † *mna* by Goetz-Schoell.

¹⁷ ἡ πέτρ' ἢ τρεῖς πίν' ἢ μὴ τέτραπα, a proverbial expression noted in Plut., *Quaest. Conv.*, III, 9, 1; Athenaeus, X, 426d; Eustathius, *In Od.*, p. 1624 *extr.*

scattered, except in the opening scene spoken by the girls and their father, which is fittingly more severe in tone. It is noteworthy that the words of the parasite are no more Greek than the general Greek tone of the whole play. The *Stichus*, which we know to have been produced in 200 B. C., shows some slight beginnings of concentration, and falls, therefore, between Groups I and II.

The *Trinummus* reveals more artistry. The opening serious scene, being between *senes*, is marked only by the superbly conceived *παῦσαι*, 187. Lysiteles' monody offers little more (*harpago* 239, *sandigerula* amidst a mass of caterers to women 253, *apage* 258, 266) perhaps because of the apparent seriousness of the discussion and the amusing setting. Similarly the talk of father and son (276-401), though not marked for its humor, is free from Greek because of its dignified tone. The slave Stasimus, however, signalizes his entrance with a list of caterers of dainties, 406-408, *argentum οἶχεται* 419, *trapezitae mille drachumarum Olympico*, 425, but he fittingly confines himself to asides (and interruptions) upon the entrance of Philto. When he again takes a major part in the conversation, he is launched upon the intrigue (515-601). In the development of the plot Greek words appear only here and there (625, 668-669, 725, 760, 767, and *sycophanta*, *passim*); the most dramatic use is, naturally, by Stasimus, 705: *eugae, eugae, Lysiteles, πάλιν*. Charmides brings a lull in the Greek, which is well revived, however, by Stasimus upon his re-appearance (1008-1025), and even the *senex* himself, 1024, 1030. These words cease when the two meet, and the play ends with no further concentration. The *Trinummus* shows excellent distribution, but cannot compare with, for example, the *Persa* or *Pseudolus*. It falls, therefore, between Groups II and III.

The *Truculentus* offers several highly concentrated passages: 498-514, the boasting of Stratophanes; Cyamus' monody (551-577) with gifts for the *meretrix*, includes *domi quidquid habet eicitur* ἐξω. Stratophanes again uses Greek words with excellent effect in his scornful disgust, 609-610. Another passage, slightly concentrated, is 942-954. Other scattered words are frequently well and dramatically employed, 186, 503. The linguistic peculiarities of *Truculentus* may serve in place of much that

might otherwise have been Greek (cf. the Punic in the *Poenulus*) in 256-321. The distribution is often of a negative character also: more exciting scenes have less Greek (352-447, 645-698, 854-892); and amusing monologues, too (22-94, 209-255, 448-481). The *Truculentus*, though by no means as well constructed as the *Pseudolus*, with which Cicero links ¹⁸ it, warrants a position between Groups II and III.

These groups, when observed beside suggested chronologies,¹⁹ tell their own story:

		(Puttner)	(Sedgwick)	(Westaway)
I	{	Asin.	Miles	Miles
		Merc.	Cist.	Merc.
		Cist.	Asin.	Cist.
		Miles	Merc.	Asin.
		Poen.	Capt.	Most.
I-II	{	Epid.	Poen.	Men.
		Men.	Cure.	Men.
		Stich.	Stich.	Poen.
II	{	Merc.	Trin.	Miles
		Epid.	Capt.	Stich.
		Most.	Men.	Epid.
		Rud.	Aul.	Aul.
		Amph.	Amph.	Rud.
II-III	{	Aul.	Cist.	Persa
		Truc.	Rud.	Cure.
		Trin.	Truc.	Pseud.
		Cure.	Most.	Trin.
		Pseud.	Bacch.	Bacch.
III	{	Bacch.	Epid.	Truc.
		Persa	Persa	Cas.
		Cas.	Pseud.	
		Cas.	Cas.	

In so subjective a test as this it is not presumed to determine the order within each group, nor even to preserve the transition-groups inviolate, but the point of importance is this: the similarity of the sequence as a whole with the chronologies suggested cannot be dismissed as a coincidence.²⁰ There is an

¹⁸ *De Sen.*, XIV, 50.

¹⁹ V. Puttner, *Zur Chronologie der Plaut. Komödien*, progr. Ried, 1905-06. W. B. Sedgwick, *C. R.*, XXXIX (1925), pp. 55 ff.; *C. Q.*, XXIV (1930), pp. 102 ff. K. M. Westaway, *The Original Element in Plautus*, Cambridge, 1917. (In this work the *Amph.* and *Capt.* are not dated).

²⁰ If lines be drawn through the plays in four columns, it will be seen that there are few marked salients, some of which may be eliminated by

undeniable differentiation between early, middle, and late plays of our author. Greater variation among the middle plays is to be expected,²¹ since the differences are smaller and more difficult to detect, but it is highly significant that the grouping of five early plays (Group I) is generally agreed, and of four late ones (*Pseud.*, *Bacch.*, *Persa*, *Cas.*), and the indeterminate central position of *Stich.*, *Rud.*, *Aul.*, *Amph.* Aside from individual considerations which may have influenced Plautus in particular plays²² or at particular times, which we cannot determine now, we are irresistibly drawn to the conclusion not that the number of Greek words, but that the art with which Plautus used these words grew with the experience of years.

From the beginning Plautus naturally enough employed Greek words as rhetorical embellishments to the description of things or situations which themselves suggested Greece or Greek habits, as luxury, both culinary and sexual, Greek athletics and exercise, military language,—all of which would be familiar to Roman soldiers on foreign soil.²³ To this practice Plautus adhered even more strongly in the later plays. This, however, is of slight importance compared to the art which he learned about the turn of the second century, and which he practised with increasing skill for the remainder of his life. In his early

reference to the arguments of the scholar in question. In Puttner's list the only serious divergence is the *Poenulus* which he, most unconvincingly and in disagreement with all modern views, places in the last years of Plautus. Puttner's lists are based on meter and historical allusions. Sedgwick's list is constructed in accordance with the number of lyric lines per play, increasing from the *Miles*. The disagreements here are *Trin.*, *Cist.*, and *Epid.* For the last two Sedgwick distrusts his own figures, because of mutilation and probable shortening respectively. The danger of too close reliance upon the details of order, against which he himself gives warning, is exemplified by his position of the *Trin.*, known to have been produced after 194 B. C., twelve places earlier than the *Pseud.*, 191 B. C. Westaway's list, based on increasing Roman elements, needs no comment beyond a reference to Sedgwick's just criticism (*C. Q.*, XXIV [1930], p. 105) of her unusual decision regarding the *Miles*.

²¹ Cf. the variant but generally central positions of the *Most.* and *Curc.*

²² Cf., however, F. W. Hall, *op. cit.*, for several other linguistic obsessions.

²³ Cf. discussion by T. Frank, *Life and Literature*, pp. 69-73.

usage Greek words and even actual Greek (*Asin.*, *Miles*, *Poen.*, *Epid.*) were scattered through the plays to amuse the audience, but as a whole they were not arranged with any artistic purpose. He gradually concentrated these words where their numbers would have more effect than the same number scattered; moreover, he turned this effect to advantage by a careful selection of the scenes in which to use the words. Inorganic scenes are a characteristic particularly of ancient comedy; organic scenes are those in which the exposition is given, the plot planned and executed, and the discovery made. The remaining, inorganic, scenes of necessity hold less interest unless the author makes them amusing in themselves, in spite of their irrelevancy to the plot. Ancient playwrights (for this includes the original Greek writers) did this by introducing totally unnecessary characters (cooks, parasites, Lucio in the *Miles*) whose glib dialogue or monologue could justify itself. But much of this would be lost in translation, and was lost, until Plautus turned these apparently poor scenes into good ones by gradually concentrating his amusing and elegant Greek into these inorganic scenes. Conventional monologues, necessary in ancient drama for the expression of personal feeling, were also good fields for such adornment. Elsewhere, in the organic scenes, he reserved his Greek, especially interjections, for moments of particular drama or excitement,—as with us a “Bravo” is stronger and more impulsive, as well as more elegant, than the simple “Good” or “Fine”. By this means tedious scenes were enlivened, and elements alien to the plot, even if technically they had no more excuse for intruding, at least were the more amusing for the greater *chic* of the lines. In a word, plays were more artistically written regardless of the excellence of the particular intrigue employed.

But this development moved in another direction also. These words were not only concentrated in shorter passages, but they were concentrated into the mouths of characters where they would be more fitting and more clever. Leo long ago observed ²⁴ that most of the actual Greek is spoken by slaves, or other persons of low standing. My analyses have shown an increasing tendency to place Greek words of all kinds into the mouths of

²⁴ *Hermes*, XVIII (1883), p. 566; *Plaut. Forsch.*, 2nd ed., 1912, p. 106.

such persons; note the comparatively small amount of Greek in the parasites' parts in the *Men.*, *Capt.*, and *Stich.*, as compared with the later *Curc.* Monologues, already observed to be good subjects for embellishment, form a large part of the parasite's rôle (for he is rarely an organic part of the action; see above); the form and the character were both suited to Graecisms. This is true also of slaves, for they, in order to explain and rejoice over their stratagems, appear in monodies more prominently than free born characters. Greek color, moreover, is especially fitting to slaves as a vehicle for their vaunted cleverness and impudence, for to the Romans of Plautus' day slaves were commonly of foreign, and often of Greek tongue, if not as commonly as has formerly been supposed.²⁵

The result of this development on Plautus' art was a tremendous advance in the effect of many passages. An interesting example may be observed by comparing *Amph.* 1011-1012 with *Epid.* 197-200. These passages, long observed²⁶ to be identical in thought and purpose, reveal, in the greater number of Greek words employed in the *Amphitruo*, the careful artistry of the maturer playwright, who had learned the effect of "lubratorium, pharmacist's shop, and tonsorial parlor" to be infinitely more telling than "filling station, drug store, and barber shop." Plautus has learned the art of concentration.

A final comparison which testifies to the development of this art may be seen in Tuchhaendler's indices of Greek words listed according to the type of speaker. Whether by design or chance, the three plays chosen for this purpose are the *Miles*, *Poenulus* and *Pseudolus*, thus affording a contrast of early and late plays. These lists²⁷ serve to confirm the conclusions to which I have come concerning the *increasing* attribution to such characters.

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY.

JOHN N. HOUGH.

²⁵ Cf. T. Frank, *Life and Literature*, p. 80.

²⁶ Puttner uses this very comparison as an index to the date of the *Amph.*, i. e., after an emporium had been built in Rome, 193.

²⁷ Tuchhaendler, *op. cit.*, p. 70; there is also (p. 69) a list of the speakers of all Greek words which appear but once in Plautus. The only comment is "Ex quo etiam illud apparebit maximam insignium tralatorum partem in ore hominum inferioris ordinis, maxime servorum esse." Leo's observation (*Hermes*, XVII [1883], p. 566) took no note of this dissertation.

THE EXPENSE ACCOUNT OF THE SAMIAN WAR.

In reconstructing the document (*I. G.*, I², 293) which records the Athenian expenses for the Samian war in 441-439 B. C., I have offered an interpretation¹ which has found general acceptance in principle, but which has caused skepticism because of the long line of 93 letters used in the restorations. Woodward, for example, notes with surprise this supposed width of the stone,² and Wade-Gery remarks that the restored lines are almost "incredibly" long.³

This criticism is justified, and I have endeavored to find a satisfactory restoration which will permit the same logical interpretation of the document with a shorter line. One compelling reason for assuming a narrower stele is the relative thinness of the fragments, where both obverse and reverse surfaces are preserved. In documents of a similar category, it may be observed that *I. G.*, I², 296 has lines of 84 letters and is 0.204 m. thick, and that *I. G.*, I², 295 has lines of 33-35 letters and is 0.12 m. thick. Though this canon of proportions (of relative width to thickness of a stele) can be taken into account in only a general way, it does seem reasonable that 93 letters make too wide a stone, when the thickness is only 0.14 m. The following restoration is based upon a line of 64 instead of 93 letters.

I. G., I², 293

ΣΤΟΙΧ. 64

.....εκ[- - - - -]
εσε[- - - - -]
 ...σοσι[- - - - -]
 ... Φρεά[ρριος - - - - -]

5 ΗΔΔ[ΠΤΤΤ [- - - - -]

Ἀθηναῖοι ἀ[νέλοσαν ἐπὶ Τιμοκλέος καὶ ἐπὶ Μορυχίδο ἄρχοντος
 Ἀθηναίους ἐς τὸν]

πρὸς Σαμίο[ς πόλεμον· τάδε παρέδωσαν ἡοι ταμίαι ἐκ πόλεος ἀπὸ
 τὸν χρημάτων τῆς]

Ἀθηναίης Π[ολιάδος στρατηγοῖς τοῖς πρὸς Σαμίος· ἀνάλομα παρὰ
 ταμῶν ἐκ πόλεο]

ς ἡοῖς Φυρό[μαχος ἐγραμμάτενε ἐπὶ τῆς βολῆς ἡῆι¹².....
 πρῶτος ἐγραμμά]

¹ Meritt, *Athenian Financial Documents*, pp. 42-56, especially p. 47.

² *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology*, XX (1933), 198.

³ *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, LIII (1933), 135.

- 10 τερε· ταμία[ι· - - - - - ε']
 χς Οἶο Ναυσ[- - - - -]
 ΗΗΗΗΠΔΠΤΤΤ [- - - - -]
 Παρὰ ταμῶ[ν ἐκ πόλεος ἰοῖς Δεμόστρατος ἐγραμμάτενε ἐπὶ τῆς
 βολῆς ἡῖ Ἐπιχαρ]
 ἰνος Περαι[εὺς πρῶτος ἐγραμμάτενε στρατηγοῖς τοῖς πρὸς Σαμῖος
 ἀνάλομα δεύτ]
- 15 ερον· ἰοῖδε [ταμίαι ἔσαν· - - - - -]
 Ἀφιδναῖος [- - - - -]
 ΠΗΗΗΗΗΠΤΤΤΤ [- - - - -]
 χσύμπαντο[ς κεφάλαιον τῷ ἐς Βυζαντίος καὶ ἐς Σαμῖος ἀναλόματος -]
 ΧΗ[Η]ΗΗ [- - - - -]
- 20 - - - - -
Fragmentum sedis incertae (E. M. 6755; cf. A. J. A.,
 XXXVIII [1934], 69, no. 5)
 - - - - - α - - - - -
 - - - - - ο ν ε - - - - -
 - - - - - ε σ ε - - - - -
 - - - - - β ο - - - - -
- 25 - - - - -

There is, indeed, one distinct advantage in this restoration, other than the appropriate narrower width of the stone, in that the phrase *φοσεφισαμένο τῷ δέμο τὴν ἄδειαν* is omitted from line 7. It is probable that the preliminary vote of *ἄδεια* for war loans was necessary only after the decrees of Kallias in 434 B. C.⁴

In line 15 I now restore *ἰοῖδε* in place of the earlier *ἰοι δέ*. Cf. *I. G.*, I², 90, line 44: *αἶδε πόλε[ς] ἐσίν*.

Since the names of the treasurers of Athena for 440-39 are known from *I. G.*, I², 355,⁵ it is apparent that they cannot all be listed here in lines 15-16 with their demotics. This was originally my principal reason for positing a longer line; but it is possible that two or more demotics were omitted, thus allowing the present restoration of the text. A good example of a similar phenomenon at about this same time appears in *I. G.*, I², 358.⁶

BENJAMIN D. MERITT.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

⁴ E. Meyer, *Forschungen*, II, p. 112, note 1.

⁵ Meritt, *Athenian Financial Documents*, p. 40.

⁶ Cf. Meritt, *op. cit.*, pp. 38-40.

REPORTS.

PHILOLOGUS, LXXXVIII (N. F. XLII), 1933. Heft 3 and 4.

Pp. 245-253. Eduard Schwartz, Zweisprachigkeit in den Kon-
silsakten. At least until the time of Justinian, the Church, like
the Empire itself, was bilingual. All the councils of the Empire,
except that of Sardika, were held in the Greek-speaking East.
The evidence for the bilingual quality of the acts of the various
councils is here presented. Various efforts were made to produce
a *corpus canonum*; finally Pope Hormisdas caused to be pre-
pared a corpus from Nicaea to Chalcedon with the Greek and
Latin text in parallel columns. Only the preface to this work
has survived.

Pp. 254-258. Leopold Wenger, Superficies solo cedit. This
Roman principle, that a building erected on another's land
became the property of the owner of the land, was spoken of in
Roman law codes as though it existed in natural law. The
principle may actually have developed from popular law, or it
may have been influenced by Hellenistic practice.

Pp. 259-264. K. Latte, Zu dem neuen Sophronfragment.
The text of the recently discovered fragment is given, and the
content is explained as part of a magic charm addressed to
Hecate. The piece was designed for recitation by a single actor.
Fragments of this type serve to cast light on the mimes of
Theocritus and Herodas.

Pp. 265-271. Rudolf Pfeiffer, Ein Epodenfragment aus dem
Iambenbuche des Kallimachos. The epodic fragment recently
published by Norsa and Vitelli is to be assigned to Callimachus,
not to Archilochus. The text of the fragment is given, and the
point is made that all criteria of language, style, and versification
point to Callimachus as the author.

Pp. 272-295. Johannes Stroux, Die Constitutio Antoniniana.
A discussion of Giessen papyrus No. 40 containing Caracalla's
edict about Roman citizenship. Various attempts to restore the
lacunae are discussed, and a new reading of the papyrus is offered
in order to clear up the question concerning those people to whom
the citizenship was to be extended and those to whom it was to
be denied.

Pp. 296-301. Diedrich Schäfer, Zu den ptolemäischen
ΠΙΣΤΕΙΣ. An examination of various types of safe-conduct
dating back to the second century B. C., and a comparison of
these with similar Coptic documents. These Ptolemaic safe-
conduct passes are designed primarily to protect the holder
against interference of various kinds.

Pp. 302-325. Richard Uhdén, *Das Erdbild in der Tetrabiblos des Ptolemaios*. It appears that the map in the geographical chapter of the *Tetrabiblos* was the work of a Roman author, and was taken over by Ptolemy through intermediate sources. The source cannot be identified with any certainty. The map is elaborately discussed in all its aspects, and is compared with other ancient geographical descriptions. The article is illustrated with two sketches, the first of which is an attempted reconstruction of the Hellenistic-Roman map of the first century after Christ, the second a sketch of a similar map of the eleventh century.

Pp. 326-341. Friedrich Solmsen, *Die Theorie der Staatsformen bei Cicero de re publ. I*. Cicero's discussion of the various forms of government is examined in order to determine what the composition of the passage shows with regard to the sources employed. It is probable that the argument of Cicero goes back to a Peripatetic source. It may be concluded that in the theoretical discussion of the *mixtum genus* in Book I Cicero follows Dicaearchus, while in its application to Rome in Book II Polybius is the source.

Pp. 342-346. *Miszellen*. Karl Praechter(†), *Heraklit Fragm. 51 D. und die Aristoteleskommentatoren*. An attempt to explain Heraclitus' figure of the bow and the lyre. The commentators of Aristotle had said that of two mutually opposed elements, neither can exist without the other; this may be used to explain the similitude of the bow. It cannot be determined whether the connection which is here discussed is due to Heracliteans of the period of Aristotle or whether it is due to the Peripatetics themselves.

Pp. 347-361. Karl Deichgräber, *Hymnische Elemente in der philosophischen Prosa der Vorsokratiker*. An examination of the style of the fragment of Anaxagoras (B 12 Diels) shows certain elements whose origin may be traced back to religion and cult. It is difficult to say exactly what the source was; it may have been an Orphic hymn to Zeus. At any rate it may be said that the style of Anaxagoras, Diogenes, Philolaos and other Pre-Socratics has been influenced by monotheistic hymns.

Pp. 362-391. Walter Siegfried, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte von Aristoteles' Politik*. Aristotle's *Politics* was put together from papers left by him after his death. It is not a literary work, not a text-book, it is rather a preliminary collection of material. In point of time, Book I belongs between Books II and III. Books III-VI have a close connection. The oldest parts are Book II and Books VII/VIII. Next to these come I and III. The editor of the *Politics* had contented himself with putting together the papers left by Aristotle, and had avoided

any effort to reconcile the divergencies. This is an advantage because it allows us to observe how the work really grew.

Pp. 392-414. Ella Birmelin, *Die kunsttheoretischen Gedanken in Philostrats Apollonios*. Conclusion of the preceding article, pp. 149-180. We begin with a quotation from VI, 19 in which the phantasia theory is set forth. This is compared with the Aristotelian mimesis and is found to be substantially identical with it. In Aristotle phantasia is not an esthetic term; Philolaos carried it over from Peripatetic psychology into the criticism of art. The article closes with some observations on the mimesis theory of Antiochus in Cicero and Philostratus.

Pp. 415-442. Ferdinand Mentz, *Die klassischen Hundennamen*. Conclusion of the preceding article, pp. 104-129, and 181-202. The alphabetical list of dogs' names is brought to an end. At the end of the article is a list of Roman dogs' names, followed by some general observations on ancient nomenclature for pets.

Pp. 443-456. Günther Jachmann, *Zum Pseudolus des Plautus*. An effort to distinguish the Greek elements of the play from those added by Plautus. An effort is made to reconstruct the Greek original in some measure, and on the basis of this, conclusions are reached regarding the Plautine additions.

Pp. 457-466. Wilhelm Kroll, *Rhetorica*. Many of the so-called Stoic influences on Roman rhetoric are to be attributed elsewhere. In general the Stoic interest in rhetoric was theoretical rather than practical. Cicero, for instance, knew only the work of Cleanthes and Chrysippus, and neither of these had any practical validity. Neither is there any reason to believe in a Stoic-Pergamene grammar. The influences which were supposed to be Stoic are largely Peripatetic. As a matter of fact, rhetoric and grammar had their common roots in the first Sophistic; it was the Peripatetics who later developed both studies.

Pp. 467-487. *Miszellen*. Pp. 467-469. Kurt Latte, *Nachtrag zu dem neuen Sophronfragment S. 259 ff.* A recently discovered fragment which forms part of the previously discussed passage necessitates several revisions in the text as given there. Pp. 469-473. Ludwig Deubner, *Ein Punkt zum Aufbau des Carmen saeculare*. If we put a period after v. 44 we have the following arrangement: 3 strophes to Apollo and Diana, 5 to the goddesses of night, 3 to Apollo and Diana, 4 to Jupiter and Juno, 3 to Apollo and Diana, and the concluding strophe. The arrangement makes clear that Apollo and Diana rule the festival and its song; the total number of strophes (19) corresponds to the number of years of the Metonic cycle. Pp. 473-476. Josef Svennung, *Handschriften zu den ps.-klementinischen Recognitiones*. Various additions to the list given in Harnack. Pp. 476-

477. Fritz Walter, *Zu Ammianus Marcellinus*. Various corrections in the text. Pp. 477-482. Ernst Darmstaedter, *Anthemios und sein "künstliches Erdbeben" in Byzanz*. Agathias' description of the artificial earthquake produced by Anthemius probably did not present a good picture of the event since the author's ignorance of mechanics prevented him from understanding the experiment fully. On the other hand, a joke like that perpetrated by Anthemius would not necessarily involve any elaborate apparatus. Pp. 482-487. Otto Schroeder, *ΚΩΛΑΡΙΑ*. Wilamowitz had conjectured that the original Greek verse form was a free verse of four stresses or eight syllables. The present article is a discussion of various short verses which do not fit into this scheme together with some attempt to illustrate the connection between these short verses and other longer forms.

HARRISON C. COFFIN.

UNION COLLEGE.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES.

The American Council of Learned Societies offers in 1935 grants in aid of research and post-doctoral fellowships for training and research in the humanities. The grants are in two categories: small grants, not exceeding \$300, and larger grants, not exceeding \$1,000. Applicants for grants must possess the doctorate or its equivalent, and must be actually in need of the desired assistance and unable to secure it from other sources. The grants are made for specific purposes (other than living expenses or in lieu of salary), such as travel, photostats, secretarial assistance, etc., in connection with projects of research actually under way.

The fellowships have a basic stipend of \$1,800, to which allowances for travel, expenses of research, and other purposes may be added. Applicants must have the doctorate, must not be more than 35 years of age, and must have demonstrated unmistakable aptitude for constructive research.

Information respecting grants and fellowships, as well as application blanks, may be secured from the American Council of Learned Societies, 907 Fifteenth Street, Washington, D. C. All applications must be filed by December 15, 1934, and awards will be announced in March, 1935.

REVIEWS.

STANISLAS LYONNET. *Le parfait en arménien classique*, principalement dans la traduction des évangiles et chez Eznik (= Collection linguistique publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris, xxxvii). Champion, Paris, 1933. 188 pp. 50 francs.

In 1911, Meillet wrote his 'L'Emploi des formes personnelles des verbes' (*MSLP* xvi, 92-131) as the fourth of his 'Recherches sur la syntaxe comparée de l'arménien', and in 1930, Vogt studied the difference in aspect between the present-imperfect and aorist in 'Les deux thèmes verbaux de l'arménien classique' (*Norsk tidsskrift for sprogvidenskap*, iv, 192-245). Paralleling Renou's *Valeur du parfait dans les hymnes védiques* (Paris, 1925) and Chantraine's *Histoire du parfait grec* (Paris, 1927; vols. xviii and xxi of the same series), we now have a careful study of the Armenian perfect by Father Lyonnet, a pupil of two of the most distinguished Armenists of Europe, M. Meillet of the Collège de France and Fr. Mariès of the Institut Catholique de Paris. The conclusions, which are sound throughout, are of value not only for Armenian and Indo-European linguistics, but also for Biblical exegesis. A check of Fr. Lyonnet's citations with the Gothic, Old Church Slavic, and Vulgate versions (the Syriac may be omitted here because of the totally different Semitic 'tense' system) shows that the delicacy of the relations of the Armenian perfect to the aorist and imperfect surpasses not only them—as one would expect—but even Greek itself. This is a welcome confirmation of an opinion that this reviewer has long held: *no Biblical exegesis or Biblical text-criticism is complete unless it carefully considers the Classical Armenian version* (cf. also F. Macler, *Le texte arménien de l'évangile d'après Matthieu et Marc*, Paris, 1919).

As an example of this delicacy we may cite Mk. v, 39: *τί θορυβεῖσθε καὶ κλαίετε*. Here the Vulgate, Gothic, and Old Church Slavic (Zographus) have, like the Greek, only presents (*quid turbamini et ploratis*; *hwa auhjoþ jah gretip*; *čito mlŭvite i plačete*), but the Armenian has one perfect and one present: *zi xroveal ēk' ew layk'*, 'why are ye (now) in a tumultuous state (in consequence of past emotion) and (continuously) weeping?' (similarly the Anglo-Saxon version, made from Old Latin: *hwī synd ge gedrēfede and wēpaþ*?). The accuracy with which the Armenian text translates the real meaning without being bound to slavish rendering of form by form may be illustrated from John vi, 46: *οὐχὶ ὅτι τὸν Πατέρα ἐώρακέν τις, εἰ μὴ ὁ ὢν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὗτος ἐώρακεν τὸν Πατέρα* = *ibrew oç et'e z-Hayr uruk'*

teséal içē et'e oç or ēn y-Astucoy, na etes z-Hayr, 'not as if anyone may be in the state of one who hath had sight of the Father (and is permanently affected thereby) except him who is from God; he hath seen the Father (as a definite fact, once and for all)'. Here the Greek perfect is rendered, according to its *nuances*, first by a perfect subjunctive, and then by an aorist indicative.

Fr. Lyonnet's conclusions may be summarised as follows. The perfect, 'generally speaking, does not indicate action (whether continuing without fixed termination—like the present—or ending at a definite point—like the aorist), but essentially a *state* acquired in consequence of action and resultant upon it' (pp. 9, 42-43, 67; cf. the two examples just quoted, and also John xviii, 37: *εἰς τοῦτο ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον* = *i doyn isk ekeal em y-ašzarh*, 'for this am I come into the world [and am there present]', as contrasted with v, 43: *ἐγὼ ἐλήλυθα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Πατρὸς μου* = *es eki y-anun Hawr imoy*, 'I came [as a definite act] in My Father's name'). This state, however, is only that of the subject; the state of the object is not designated in the NT (pp. 90-91). Consequently, since in the latter case the action is emphasised, the perfect is avoided, and the aorist is used instead, as Mk. v, 34: *ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε* = *hawatk' k'o keçuçin z-k'ez*, 'thy faith saved thee' (as an act performed once and for all) (contrast Vulgate *salvam fecit*, Anglo-Saxon *håle gedyde*). [Sometimes, however, the state of the object does seem to be expressed; cf. the passage Mk. xiii, 20, to be quoted presently.] In Eznik, the state of the object may be expressed, so that the perfect may be employed, as (p. 93) *vasn aynorik t'oleal ē Astucoy z-Satanay*, 'therefore God hath left Satan (on earth, where he still remains)'.²

The perfect of completed action is unknown in Classical Armenian, the aorist being used instead (pp. 104-112); and the pluperfect denotes the result of an act as laid in the past (p. 113), e. g., Lk. viii, 2: *ἀπ' ἧς δαίμόνα ἐπὶ ἐξεληλύθει* = *y-ormē ewt'n dewn eleal ēr*, 'from whom seven devils had gone out (and remained out)', as contrasted with viii, 46: *ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔγνων δύναμιν ἐξεληλυθῆσαν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ* = *k'anzi gitaci et'e zawrut'iwn el y-inēn*, 'for I perceived (as a fact) that power went forth (as an actual event) from Me (but did not remain outside Me)'. The pluperfect may also express anteriority of action (pp. 113-118), as John xix, 39: *ἦλθεν δὲ καὶ ὁ Νικοδήμους, ὁ ἑλθὼν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν νυκτὸς τὸ πρῶτον* = *ekn ew Nikodemos or ekealn ēr ař Yisus i gišeri z-aražinn*, 'and there came (as an actual event) also Nicodemus, who had first come (at an anterior time; cf. John iii, 1-2, *ἦλθεν* = *ekn*) to Jesus by night' (but had not remained with Him throughout His ministry).

In past unreal conditional sentences the verb of the protasis is normally in the pluperfect indicative, and that of the apodosis

in the imperfect indicative, though occasionally both clauses show the imperfect (pp. 118, 123, 127), as Mk. xiii, 20: *καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐκολόβωσεν ὁ Θεὸς τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκείνας . . . οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σὰρξ· ἀλλὰ διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς οὓς ἐξελέξατο ἐκολόβωσεν τὰς ἡμέρας* = *ew et'e oç ēr karčēal Astucoy z-awursn z-aynosik . . . oç aprēr amēnayn marmīn: ayl vasn antreloç z-ors antreaç, karčēac z-awursn z-aynosik*, 'and except God had shortened those days (so that they remained shortened [?]) . . . no flesh escaped, but because of the elect whom He elected (as an act once and for all), He did (as matter of fact) shorten those days'; John iv, 10: *εἰ ᾔδεις τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ Θεοῦ . . . σὺ ἂν ᾔτησας αὐτὸν καὶ ἔδωκεν ἅν σοι ὕδωρ ζῶν* = *et'e giteir du z-pargewsn Astucoy . . . du ardewk' andreir i nmanē ew tayr k'ez jur kendani*, 'if thou wert (continuously) knowing the gift of God, . . . thou wouldst be asking of Him, and He would be giving thee living water'. That we have here a very old construction seems clear from its regular occurrence in Greek (Goodwin, *Greek Moods and Tenses*, §§ 410, 435-440); and the indicative is occasionally found in the apodosis of unreal conditions in Latin, e.g., Tacitus, *Ann.* i, 63: *trudebanturque in paludem . . . nī Caesar productas legiones instruxisset*.

A special section (pp. 144-152) is devoted to compound tenses after *minč čew* 'before', e.g., with the perfect indicative, Lk. ii, 21: *πρὸ τοῦ συλλημφθῆναι αὐτόν* = *minč čew ylaceal ēr z-na*, 'before (His Mother) had conceived Him', and with the perfect subjunctive, as John iv, 49: *Κύριε, κατάβηθι πρὶν ἀποθανεῖν τὸ παιδίον μου* = *Tēr, ēj minč čew mēreal icē manukn im*, 'Lord, come down ere my child be dead'. The basal meaning of *minč čew* is 'while . . . not yet' (p. 147), so that the full meaning of the last citation, for example, would be, 'come down while my child lies dying, (but) is not yet a corpse'. Fr. Lyonnet gives no etymology for *minč*, and this reviewer knows of none that has been proposed. Perhaps, however, one may suggest that the word means 'one thing' > 'simultaneously' > 'while' (i. e., *mi + inč*; cf. respectively Greek *μία* < **σμία* and Sanskrit *kīmcit*), and that it may be comparable semantically with Latin *eādem operā, unā operā, unā* 'with the same (one) effort, at the same time, together', e.g., Plautus, *Capt.* 450, *eādem opera a praetóre sumam sýngraphum*; *Amphit.* 338, *mandáta eri perierunt, una et Sósia*.

A chapter is devoted to the perfect participle in pure nominal sentences (pp. 153-160), where it serves as a narrative tense—comparatively rare in the Gospels; and the results obtained are summarised in a conclusion (pp. 161-165).

The interesting Armenian construction in the transitive perfect merits further discussion than Fr. Lyonnet—who does not write from the linguistic point of view—has given it (pp. 68 sqq.). Here the verbal noun in *-eal* (formally coinciding in Armenian with the perfect participle) governs an object in the accusative,

the logical subject being in the possessive genitive, e. g., John iv, 29: ἴδετε ἄνθρωπον ὃς εἶπέν μοι πάντα ἃ ἐποίησα = *tesēk' z-ayr mi* or *asaç inj z-amenayn* or *inç im gorçeal ē*, 'videte virum unum qui dixit mihi omnem quam rem mei facere est' = 'see a man who hath told me (as an actual event) every thing which I have done (and of which, consequently, I am now guilty)'. That this construction is a Caucasianism, as has been suggested, seems very unlikely (cf. also G. Deeters, *Armenisch und Südkaukasisch*, Leipzig, 1927, pp. 75-83). It appears to be simply a special development of one type of the numerous *nomina agentis* which govern accusatives (see Brugmann, *Grundriss*, II, ii, 637-638, iii, 502, 946), and in particular it seems comparable to such types as Latin *quid tibi hanc curatior rem* (Plautus, *Amphit.* 519) and Lithuanian *táva šēpę budavójims* 'the building of thy ship' (cf. E. Fränkel, *Syntax der litauischen Kasus*, Kaunas, 1928, p. 101). Similarly *πολλάκις συνήχθη Ἰησοῦς ἐκεί μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ* (John xviii, 2) is rendered by *bazum angam žoloveal ēr andr Yisusi ašakertawk'n handerj*, 'many times there was assembling there of Jesus with His disciples': ἐχάρητε ἅν (John xiv, 28) by *urax leal ēr jer*, 'there were rejoicing of you' = 'ye would have rejoiced'; and ἅν . . . μετενόησαν (Mat. xi, 21 = Lk. x, 13) by *apašxareal ēr*, 'there had been repenting (of Tyre and Sidon)'.

One insignificant slip has been noticed: at least three instances of ἀφεω- are known instead of two (p. 56), the third being ἀφεωσθω τας μαρτυρίας (IG V, ii, 357¹² = Schwyzer, no. 668), 'let him be excused from testifying'.

LOUIS H. GRAY.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

OTTO RIETH. *Grundbegriffe der Stoischen Ethik*. Berlin, 1933. Pp. 209. (Problemata, Heft 9.)

The problem of reconstructing the history of the Stoic philosophy is set forth in the early pages of this book with refreshing sanity. After an excellent criticism of the "methods" of Hirzel, Schmekel, and Reinhardt, all of whom sought to establish the peculiar doctrines of particular Stoics without any thorough consideration of the general Stoic doctrine or of its original nature in Chrysippus' teaching, although their own procedure thereby entailed a *petitio principii*, Rieth rightly says that our sources allow us in general only the reconstruction of what in Imperial times was considered the common Stoic system. In agreement with von Arnim that this was substantially the system of Chrysippus, he attempts a portrayal of Stoic ethics.

It is a pleasant surprise to discover that this projected treatment of the ethics never degenerates into mere dithyramb or

catalogue, the two common forms of the ethical treatise. The general thesis of the book is that the Stoic ethics is understood only by a careful study of Stoic logic; and practically the thesis is proved, for the ethical doctrines gain a consistency thereby which they seldom display in other treatments. That the logical doctrines were developed in consequence of the requirements of the ethics is made plausible; but it still seems likely that the Stoic categories are the result of direct logical criticism of Aristotle's categories and not simply the outcome of Stoical ethical requirements. (In particular the category *ὑποκείμενον* looks like an outgrowth of criticism of the emptiness of the Aristotelian *οὐσία*.)

Rieth succeeds in refuting completely the common notion that each category contains the preceding one within itself. According to his interpretation 1) *ὑποκείμενα* are necessarily *ποιά*, 2) *πρός τί πως ἔχοντα* are necessarily *πῶς ἔχοντα*, 3) *ποιά* must be either *ὑποκείμενα* or *πῶς ἔχοντα* and cannot be both, 4) *πῶς ἔχοντα* must be either *ποιά* or *πρός τί πως ἔχοντα* and cannot be both. (The statement on page 71: "oder ist es zuetwas und zugleich differenziert" is, at least, misleading. It cannot be right, lest every *πρός τί πως ἔχον* be also *ποιόν* which is impossible according to Simplicius 166, 12.)

The Stoic relationship of *διαίρεσις* and *ὅρος* is connected with the Platonic method, according to Rieth, who also sees the model for the Stoic progression from *ὑπογραφή* to *ὅρος* in the Academic sequence of concepts and on this basis claims that the Stoa consciously sought to make a synthesis of Plato and Antisthenes. Since the Stoic *διαίρεσις* depends upon the "natural" meaning of words and the ontological value of the grades in the Stoic and Platonic progressions admittedly proceeds in opposite directions, this argument is suspicious although the conclusion is not improbable.

The analysis of virtues as both *καθ' ἑαυτά* and *πρός τι*, the treatment of *ἐκλεκτικὴ ἀξία* (the identity of which with *καθήκοντα* *περιστατικά* is established), and the treatment of the relationship of *ἔξις*, in its broad sense, with *ἐνέργεια* are all satisfying; and Rieth does good service in his analysis of *προκαταρκτικά* and *συνεργά* and their relationship to each other and to *συνεκτικὰ αἷτια*. The reconciliation of determinism and "freedom of the will" (which term is rightly rejected in its modern connotation as a translation of *τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῖν*) rests upon the conception of the soul as *συνεκτικὸν αἷτιον* which is *αὐτοτελές* in requiring no external object to make the man such a one as he is. The attempt in the last section, however, to render reasonable the combined notions of Fate and Responsibility was foredoomed to failure; it is a thankless task to undertake such a service for any monism.

The notion of "Renunciation" is rightly banished from Stoic ethics; Chrysippus objected to Aristo's doctrine because he

desired to save the material of virtue and, therefore, the differentiation of natural objects and actions. Along with the Academic "conformity with Nature," however, Chrysippus wanted to maintain the independence of Virtue; and Rieth shows the result of this in the gradations assumed by the Stoa in the *κατὰ φύσιν βίος* at the same time as the *εὐδαιμονία* of the Wise Man was held separate and unaltered in intensity despite the variation of the *προηγμένα* he might possess. Here, too, despite Rieth's efforts, an inner contradiction persists, due chiefly, I feel, to the lack of any final goal for the individual. Curiously, Rieth is certain that the Platonic ethics falls short of the unified virtue of the Stoics because the norm for Plato is the commonweal. This is a complete misunderstanding of Plato; but it points to the chasm at the end of the Stoic ethics. For Plato the goal is outside time and space — beyond this world; the Stoic virtue ends in resignation — proud, perhaps, but still resignation to one's "natural place" as a fixed part in the endless world-cycle.

HAROLD CHERNISS.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

CHARLES T. SELTMAN. *Attic Vase-Painting* (Martin Classical Lectures, Volume III). Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1933. Pp. xxii + 97, figs. in text 17, pls. 37. \$1.50.

In a book of less than a hundred pages, originally five lectures delivered at Oberlin College, Mr. Seltman has given a brilliant account of the development of Attic vase-painting. Admittedly only a brief introduction to the subject, and the popularization which lectures for non-specialists must be, it is nevertheless based on the most recent studies. As anything in this field should, it derives throughout from the work of Professor Beazley, to whom the author pays tribute in his preface.

After a brief statement of the three-fold appeal of the study of ancient pottery, art is defined in the terms of its two rival interpretations, the *formal* and the *exuberant*, and the perfection of the great century of Attic vase-painting is attributed to the successful finding of the exact mean between the two. Elsewhere in the book, the transference of the treasury of the Delian Confederacy to Athens is seen as "the end of the Hellenic moral experiment," with its emphasis on moderation, and the beginning of the decline in the arts as in politics. The account of the earlier styles, though brief, builds up clearly from Geometric to fully-developed black-figure; the emphasis is placed on red-figure from the Andokides Painter to the Sotades Painter. The

last chapter discusses some of the later artists from the Niobid Painter to Aristophanes, and mentions developments in South Italy. While individuals may object that the black-figured style, white-ground lekythoi or the second half of the fifth century have been slighted, or that a certain painter or a favorite vase has been omitted, to this reviewer it seems that for the scope of his book the author has chosen and rejected wisely. A glossary of shape-names, illustrated by Caskey's drawings, and a chronological table for the styles and painters discussed are helpful additions. The plates are well chosen and the half-tones clear. The arrangement, with brief comments on the scene, approximate dates and references on the page opposite each illustration, is commendable.

The tale is told effectively, in a style which often reflects Beazley's terse and vivid phraseology. The descriptions of individual vases are frequently illuminating, and for the most part free from the tendencies to read into the picture and to sentimentalize which are apt to vitiate interpretations of works of art of any period. There are some entertaining bits: the retreating soldier on a cup by Skythes is "the Attic prototype of the Duke of Plaza Toro." The aesthetic importance of vase-painting in Athenian art of the late sixth and fifth centuries is rightly emphasized, although the statement (p. 89) that "the only 'canvas' for the painter, the only 'paper' for the draughtsman, was the surface of a vase" might lead the uninitiated into believing that there was no other painting during the period. The frequent superlatives may be attributed at least in part to the emphasis demanded by the lecture platform. Similarly, the need for brevity may account for certain statements which the author might have qualified in a more detailed discussion: for instance the implication (p. 5) that the art of Minoan Crete was concerned only with pattern.

To those interested in Greek civilization or the history of art, and to many others, the book will be a delightful introduction to an intricate subject; to the student of Greek archaeology it will have the value, often underestimated, of a fresh presentation of facts already known. The sponsors of the lectures and the publishers are to be thanked for offering so amply illustrated a volume at so modest a price.

WILHELMINA VAN INGEN.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

JOHN GARRETT WINTER. *Life and Letters in the Papyri*. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1933. Pp. viii + 308. \$3.50.

In this volume Professor Winter publishes the Jerome Lectures, which he delivered in 1929 and 1930. The copious notes which have been supplied greatly increase its usefulness.

In the first chapter, *Rome and the Romans in the Papyri* (pp. 1-45), the general Roman policy of extreme exploitation of the land and the people — a policy which worked for two centuries before beginning to fail — is commented on at the beginning, and a brief account is given of the relations of Rome and her rulers with Egypt during the whole period of the Empire. The subjects covered include the governmental organization under Rome, visits of Emperors and other eminent Romans to Egypt, the position of Roman citizens there, Caracalla's grant of Roman citizenship, Roman law, religion, and literature in Egypt, and the appearances of rival delegations of Greeks and Jews before the Emperor's court.

Chapters II and III, *The Life of the People* (pp. 46-135), introduce the reader to a great variety of topics in an order which follows in general the course of human life. Birth and the legal formalities connected with it, the exposure and adoption of children, education, apprenticeship, farming, letter writing, crime and punishment, marriage and divorce, family affection, death and burial, and letters of condolence, are all discussed, and illustrated from the papyri.

Chapter IV, *Evidences of Christianity in the Private Letters* (pp. 136-191), presents a generous selection from the Christian letters. Professor Winter seems to find in these documents much more evidence of the salutary "effects of the new faith . . . on life and conduct" (p. 148) than will probably appear evident to many readers.

Chapters V and VI are devoted to the contributions to Greek Literature made by the papyri (V. *Additions to Greek Poetry*, pp. 192-237; VI. *Additions to Greek Prose*, pp. 238-276). As regards Hesiod, Lysias, lyric, elegiac, and epigrammatic poetry, tragedy, comedy, and romance, these chapters should now be read in connection with J. U. Powell's *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature, Third Series*, Oxford, 1933. Professor Winter gives a clear outline of the important additions from the papyri to the different types of literature. The account closes with some remarks on the revolution in the principles of textual criticism which the study of the literary papyri has brought about (pp. 271-3; particularly recommended to the attention of students of the Classics), and a summary of the available information as to what was read in Egypt in every period from Alexander to the Moslems (pp. 273-6).

The author states that his aim has been "to interest primarily those who are not specialists" in papyrology (p. v). The presence of a number of quotations in the original Greek gives the impression that the non-specialist audience for whom the book is designed consists chiefly of students and teachers of the Classics. But it is actually suitable for a much wider audience. All those who are at all concerned with ancient history or ancient life should find it exceedingly interesting, and the embryo papyrologist of the English-speaking world could read it with great profit before attacking Schubart's *Einführung in die Papyruskunde* and the *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie* of Mitteis and Wilcken.

The volume includes English versions of about 150 documents from the papyri, or of substantial portions of them. A number of these are translations of unpublished papyri in the Michigan collection (see the list on p. 287). These versions of new documents will interest the more mature papyrologist, who will also find in the volume a number of new interpretations of published papyri (see p. 290), and bibliographies (including works published up to some time in 1932) of a large number of subjects with which he is concerned. As these collections of references, scattered through the footnotes, will be quite useful for the next few years, I add a list of some of the most complete and important of them:

The Roman Occupation of Egypt. P. 2, n. 1.
Edicts emanating from Rome. 6, 1.
Roman Wills. 29, 2.

Private Life in general. 47, 1.
Nursing Contracts. 55, 3.
Slavery. 57, 1.
Education. 64, 1.
Marriage. 119, 2.

Christianity. 136, 1.
Biblical and Theological Texts. 138, 1.

Literary Papyri. 193, 1.
Homer. 194, 2.
Hesiod. 198, 1.
Timotheus, *Persae*. 212, 1.
Euripides. 221, 1.
Menander. 227, 2.
Herodotus. 239, 1.
Hellenica Oxyrhynchia. 241, 1.

A few notes on minor details follow:

Doubtless it is due to the fact that these chapters were delivered as lectures that we find two very similar treatments of Satyrus' Life of Euripides, one under drama (pp. 222-3), and

one under biography (pp. 261-2). In the book the two might well have been consolidated under biography, with a cross reference in the remarks on Euripides.

In the bibliography on Sophocles' *Ichneutae* (p. 219, n. 2), R. J. Walker's large edition of the play (London, 1919) obviously deserves a place.

In connection with the remarks on the word *λιβάριος* in B. G. U. 423 (p. 42 and n. 3), it may be noted that in the republication of the text by Hunt and Edgar, *Select Papyri*, Vol. I (Loeb Classical Library, London, 1932), No. 112, the reading *αντ[ι]λιβάριω* is given.

With Professor Winter's translation (p. 152) of P. Lond. 417 comparison may now be made with that of Hunt and Edgar (No. 161), whose interpretation of one or two clauses is slightly different.

CLINTON W. KEYES.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

JOSEPH EDWARD HARRY. *Greek Tragedy: emendations, interpretations and critical notes*. Vol. I: Aeschylus and Sophocles. New York, Columbia University Press, 1933.

This book, which will be followed by a volume on Euripides, gives us Professor Harry's personal notes on the three masters of Attic tragedy. He published an earlier and briefer series under the same title in the University of Cincinnati Studies in 1914. The present volume comprises introductory notes to each play, divided into hundred-line sections, a bibliography for each author (few general works on Greek drama are included), and suitable indices under numerous heads. There are enough misprints to illustrate the introductory remarks on manuscript corruption. (*Oedipus Tryannus* at the head of pp. 148-160 should certainly avert the gods' jealousy of human perfection.) Professor Harry comments on those matters, words and passages which seem to him to need comment. The scale of the comments therefore varies from place to place. Some of the introductions to a play are summary outlines of the story; others touch upon characters of the play and other noteworthy features. This reviewer wishes that these comments were more numerous; one or two specific additions are suggested below. The bibliography also varies as to fulness; the *Prometheus Bound* commands several sections, while discussions of other plays are assembled in the miscellaneous section. This miscellaneous section and its Sophoclean companion are somewhat confusing, since titles appear under a multiple-alphabetic series of authors' names, so that one dashes from A to Z and then returns to A, several times over. The detailed notes on readings and specific passages constitute the bulk of the work. Since Professor Harry has, under-

standably, not attempted to give us a complete apparatus criticus to each play, these notes seem somewhat overloaded with conjectures which are neither approved nor refuted, so that, for instance, the notes on Aeschylus occasionally look like a minute review of the editions of Mazon and Smyth. The worth of Professor Harry's suggestions must, of course, be tested bit by bit; certainly those readings and interpretations which rest on taste and a feeling for Greek must be appraised only by one whose acquaintance with Greek literature is as thorough and mature as Harry's own. As far, however, as this reviewer's impression goes, Harry has a just respect for the manuscripts and keeps his feet on paleographic terra firma in his discussions and decisions.

Some detailed comments and queries follow.

One wonders why a Homeric word in the *Persians* l. 277 is not appropriate in Aeschylus (cf. Harry's note on the *Seven* ll. 705-8, in which he accepts Homeric diction).

This reviewer disapproves violently of part of Harry's introductory note to the *Prometheus*. He is somewhat doubtful about the remarks on the location represented in the play. His violence, however, is directed against the comment, "That a lay figure was used to represent the Titan is, I think, beyond question". This is not the place to argue the point; however, those who saw the play given at the Delphic Festival of May, 1927, know that an actor can take the part, immobility, wedge through the chest, and all, with entire success.

On the other hand, I am much obliged to Professor Harry for his keen comment on the *Seven*, that Aeschylus speaks throughout the play, not of "Thebans", who were the traitor-enemies of Plataea, but of "Cadmeans" (Eteothebans, as it were), who were of the Age of the Heroes, and could enlist sympathy.

The comment on the ending of the *Seven* might advantageously be enlarged.

Is not Agamemnon above all else war-weary? Perhaps he "grandly talks of victory" (Harry, p. 50), but this one expects—it is not the most striking part of his speech, nor the part emphasized by position.

When Agamemnon is killed, Aeschylus by no means makes the guilt strike Clytemnestra alone (Harry, p. 52). Aegisthus is the viler sinner; for Clytemnestra there is some justification and a redeeming boldness, which qualify her crime and make it tragic.

To the comment on the site of Agamemnon's palace should be added a reference to Bill's article "The Location of the Palace of the Atridae in Greek Tragedy", *T. A. P. A.*, LXI (1930), in which a view opposing Harry's is upheld. (I do not find this article mentioned in the bibliography for Aeschylus.)

The Nurse in the *Choephores* does provide relief by bringing

a touch of everyday into the pomp of tragedy; it should be said, however, that her words about her care for baby Orestes have, for those with the necessary *πάθει μᾶθος*, an appositeness and poignancy that raise them above all grotesqueness and commonplace.

The suicide of Ajax was probably not the only death enacted on-stage, for Polyxena, in Sophocles' play of that name, was apparently sacrificed on the stage, or at least as near it as is Evadne in Euripides' *Suppliants*.

Surely the *Antigone* was not suggested by the conclusion of the *Seven*; if the latter is genuine, there was a pre-existing story of Antigone, and this is the source of Sophocles' play. Comment might well be added on the character of Creon and on the problem of the play — conscience vs. the State — a problem very much alive today. The *contaminatio* of the *Antigone* and *Oedipus at Colonus* (Harry assumes that the characters, notably Creon, are developed in the two plays with consistency, as if the plays were in a trilogy) leads, for this reviewer, to confusion, and false ideas of the characterization.

The comment on the conclusion of the *Electra* might well include a reference to Sheppard's contrary view (his article appears in the bibliography).

Is it not likely that the other plays of the trilogy were responsible for the defeat of *Oedipus the King*?

One must admire Professor Harry's devotion to Greek tragedy and his long and strenuous labors at the task of interpretation. The range of his study is remarkable. He offers citations from eight literatures as parallels to various passages — an especially admirable feature of this book. He shows poise and wariness before the pitfalls of his task. This book will be useful to everyone who wants to study specific details of the plays of Aeschylus and Sophocles.

ALFRED CARY SCHLESINGER.

WILLIAMS COLLEGE.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE AMERICAN SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL STUDIES AT ATHENS.

Three fellowships of \$1,300 each are offered for 1935-1936 by The American School of Classical Studies at Athens to graduates and graduate students of colleges and universities in the United States, two fellowships in Greek archaeology, and one fellowship in the language, literature and history of the ancient Greeks. The fellowships are awarded on the basis of competitive examinations, to be held about Feb. 10, 1935. Applications, which must be made not later than January 1, 1935, and all inquiries about the fellowships should be addressed to the Chairman of the Committee on Fellowships, Professor Samuel E. Bassett, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Acropole (L'). VIII, 2. Avril-Juin, 1933. Paris, *Librairie Guillaume Budé*. Pp. 65-128. 8°.

Bonner (Campbell). A Papyrus Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas (Similitudes 2-9), with a fragment of the Mandates. Ann Arbor, *University of Michigan Press*, 1934. Pp. xi + 137 + V plates. 4°. \$3.00. (University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, XXII.)

Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé. Janvier, 1934. Paris, *Jean Malys*. Pp. 1-84. 8°.

Ciaceri (Emanuele). Tiberio, successore di Augusto. Milano-Genova-Roma-Napoli, *Società Anonima Editrice Dante Alighieri*, 1934. Pp. xi + 335. 8°. L. 30.

Classical (The) Quarterly. XXVIII, 2. April, 1934. London, *John Murray*. Pp. 63-126. 8°.

Classical (The) Review. XLVIII, 2. May, 1934. London, *John Murray*. Pp. 49-96. 8°.

Conway (R. S.), Whatmough (J.), Johnson (S. E.). The Prae-Italic Dialects of Italy. Vol. I, Part I (pp. xvi + 204, with 17 plates): The Venetic Inscriptions, collected and edited by R. S. Conway. Vol. I, Part II (pp. 205-459): The Ancient Names, Local, Divine, and Personal, of North Italy, collected, arranged, and edited by S. E. Johnson; with those of the Raeti, collected, arranged, and edited by Joshua Whatmough. Vol. II (containing Part III, pp. xxxii + 632): The Raetic, Lepontic, Gallic, East-Italic, Messapic, and Sicel Inscriptions, with the glosses in ancient writers and the local and divine names of ancient Sicily, edited with Notes and an Appendix together with Commentary, Grammar, Glossary, and an account of the Alphabets, by Joshua Whatmough. Vol. III (pp. viii + 163): Indexes. Cambridge, *Harvard University Press*, 1933. 8°.

D'Agostino (Vittorio). Uno Sguardo alla più recente produzione Italiana su Plinio il Giovani (1920-1933). Torino, *Società Editrice Internazionale*, 1933. 8°. (Estratto dal Convivium, V [1933], pp. 741-749.)

Diller (Hans). Wanderarzt und Aitiologe. Studien zur hippokratischen Schrift περί λέγων ὑδάτων τόπων. Leipzig, *Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung*, 1934. Pp. viii + 121. 8°. M. 7.60; geb. M. 9. (Philologus, Supplementband XXVI, Heft 3.)

Dumont (Paul E.). L'Īśvaragītā. Le chant de Śiva. Texte extrait du Kūrma-Purāṇa, traduit du Sanskrit. Baltimore, *The Johns Hopkins Press*, 1933. Pp. 251. 8°. \$3.00.

Emérita. Boletín de lingüística y filología clásica. Vol. I, 1-2. 1933. Madrid, *Centro de estudios históricos*.

Études (Les) Classiques. Vol. III, no. 1. 1934. Namur, *Éditions Ad. Wesmael-Charlier*. Pp. 1-160. 8°.

Fanning (Sister Maria Walburg). Maphei Vegii Laudensis De Educatione Liberorum et Eorum Claris Moribus Libri Sex. A critical text of Books I-III. Washington, *The Catholic University of America*, 1933. Dissertation. Pp. xxvi + 127. 8°. (The Catholic University of America Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin, Vol. I.)

Fargues (Pierre). Claudien. Invectives contre Eutrope. Texte Latine, avec un commentaire critique et explicatif et une introduction. Paris, *Librairie Hachette*, 1933. Pp. 137.

Ferguson (William Scott). Athenian Tribal Cycles in the Hellenistic Age. Cambridge, *Harvard University Press*, 1932. Pp. xv + 197. 8°. \$1.50. (Harvard Historical Monographs, I.)

Gagé (J.). Recherches sur les Jeux Séculaires. Paris, *Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres,"* 1934. Pp. 119. 8°. (Collection d'Études Latines publiée par la Société des Études Latines sous la direction de J. Marouzeau. Série scientifique. Vol. XI.)

Harder (Richard). Platos Kriton. Griechisch und deutsch. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1934. Pp. 74. 8°. RM. 2.

Hespéris. Archives Berbères et Bulletin de l'Institut des hautes-études Marocaines. Vol. XVI, fasc. I-II. Pp. 176. Paris, *Librairie Larose*, 1933.

Hygini Fabulae. Recensuit, prolegomenis commentario appendice instruxit H. I. Rose. Leiden, A. W. *Sijthoff*, 1934. Pp. xxxi + 217. 8°. Fl. 11.50.

Jewish (The) Quarterly Review. April, 1934. Vol. XXIV, no. 4. Philadelphia, *The Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning*. Pp. 309-418.

Journal (The) of Education. November 1, 1933 (pp. 697-736); December 1, 1933 (pp. 753-796); January 1, 1934 (pp. 1-48); February 1, 1934 (pp. 65-108). London, *William Rice*. 4°.

Kornemann (Ernst). Staaten, Völker, Männer, aus der Geschichte des Altertums. Leipzig, *Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung*, 1934. Pp. viii + 158. 8°. M. 6, geb. 7. (Das Erbe der Alten, Heft XXIV.)

Kuypers (K.). Der Zeichen- und Wortbegriff im Denken Augustins. Amsterdam, *Swets & Zeitlinger*, 1934. Pp. 99. 8°. Fl. 1.90.

Mitteilungen des Vereines klassischer Philologen in Wien. X. Jahrgang. Wien, *Verein klassischer Philologen*, 1933. Pp. 143. 8°.

Mnemosyne. Bibliotheca Classica Batava. Tertia Series. Volumen Primum. Fasciculus II. Lugduni-Batavorum, *E. J. Brill*, 1933-4. Pp. 81-160. 8°.

Norsk Riksmålsordbok. Hefte 14: god- harr. Utarbeidet av Trygve Knudsen og Alf Sommerfelt. Oslo, *H. Aschehoug & Co.*, 1934. Coll. 1565-1724. 8°. Kr. 1.00.

O'Donnell (James Francis). The Vocabulary of the Letters of Saint Gregory the Great. A Study in Late Latin Lexicography. Washington, *The Catholic University of America*, 1934. Dissertation. Pp. xix + 209. 8°. (The Catholic University of America Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin, Vol. II.)

Price (Mary Bell) and Price (Lawrence Marsden). The Publication of English Literature in Germany in the Eighteenth Century. Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1934. Pp. viii + 288. 8°. (University of California Publications in Modern Philology. Vol. XVII.)

Revue des Études Anciennes. XXXVI, 1. Janvier-Mars, 1934. Bordeaux, *Feret & Fils*. Pp. 1-176. 8°.

Stewart (Herbert L.). The Montaigne Quarter-Centenary. (Reprinted from the University of Toronto Quarterly, Vol. III, no. 2 [January, 1934], pp. 208-227.)

Svennung (J.). Wortstudien zu den spätlateinischen Oribasiusrezensionen. Uppsala, *Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri*, 1932. 8°. Kr. 4.50. (Extracted from Språkvetenskapliga Sällskapet's Förhandlingar, 1931-1933, pp. 57-146.)

Vooy's (C. J.). Lexicon Philodemeum. Pars Prior. Purmerend, *J. Muusses*, 1934. Pp. viii + 179. 8°.

Ward (Margaret M.). The Association of Augustus with Jupiter. Bologna, *Nicola Zanichelli*, 1933. (Estratto da Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni, IX [1933], pp. 203-224.)

Wheeler (Arthur L.). Catullus and the Traditions of Ancient Poetry. Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1934. Pp. x + 291. 8°. \$3.00. (Sather Classical Lectures, Vol. IX.)

INDEX TO VOLUME LV.

	PAGE		PAGE
Aeschylus, A Note on the		Chantraine's La formation des	
Agamemnon of,	153-166	noms en grec ancien, rev.,	278-280
Agamemnon of Aeschylus, A		CHERNISS, HAROLD. Review of	
Note on the,	153-166	Rieth's Grundbegriffe der	
Aljamiado Texts (A Re-		Stoischen Ethik,	374-376
joinder),	185-187	Review of Sykutris' Die	
American (The) Council of		Briefe des Sokrates und	
Learned Societies, An-		der Sokratiker,	289-290
nouncement of,	370	Cic. <i>ad Att.</i> 12, 46, 1, An	
American (The) School of		Emendation of <i>octius</i> in,	77-78
Classical Studies at		Clark's The Acts of the Apos-	
Athens, Announcement of,	382	tles, rev.,	191-192
ANDERSON, A. R. Comment on		CLARK, C. U. Review of Hed-	
Dr. Nykl's Rejoinder		fors' Compositiones ad	
(Aljamiado Texts),	188-190	Tingenda Musiva,	192-193
Argentaria, The Basilica,	74-76	Review of Pólit's Virgilio	
Aristotle's <i>Metaphysics</i> , Pre-		el Poeta y su Mision Pro-	
suppositions of,	36-48	videncial,	278
Augustus (Suetonius), II, 2,	337-339	Review of Schiaparelli's	
Augustus (26-25 B. C.), The		Note Paleografiche,	193
Spanish War of,	293-317	Closing Comment (Aljamiado	
Autun, Eumenius and the		Texts),	190
Schools of,	236-243	COFFIN, HARRISON C. Report	
Basilica (The) Argentaria,	74-76	of Philologus,	
BASSETT, SAMUEL E. The		179-181, 367-370	
Omission of the Vocative		Comment on Dr. Nykl's Re-	
in Homeric Speeches,	140-152	joinder (Aljamiado	
BATES, WILLIAM N. The		Texts),	188-190
ΚΩΦΟΙ of Sophocles,	167-174	<i>De Agri Cultura</i> , LVI, A Note	
BEESON, CHARLES H. Review		on Cato,	67-70
of Ussani's Corpus Scrip-		Domitian's Intended Edict on	
torum Ecclesiasticorum		Sacrifice of Oxen,	225-226
Latinorum,	95-96	Drexler's Plautinische Akzent-	
BENDER, HAROLD H. English		studien, rev.,	86-90
<i>strawberry</i> ,	71-74	Editorial Announcement,	196
BLAKE, FRANK R. The Origin		Elegies of Propertius, The	
of Pronouns of the First		Unity of Certain,	62-66
and Second Person,	244-248	Emendation (An) of <i>octius</i> in	
BOAS, GEORGE. Presupposi-		Cic. <i>ad Att.</i> 12, 46, 1,	77-78
tions of Aristotle's <i>Meta-</i>		English <i>strawberry</i> ,	71-74
<i>physics</i> ,	36-48	Eumenius and the Schools of	
Books Received,		Autun,	236-243
98-100, 194-196, 292,		Euripides, The <i>Heracidae</i> of,	
383-384		197-224	
BORN, LESTER K. Review of		Expense (The) Account of the	
Ghisalberti's Giovanni di		Samian War,	365-366
Garlandia,	93-94	FERGUSON, WILLIAM S. Poly-	
The Perfect Prince accord-		euktos and the Soteria,	318-336
ing to the Latin Pane-		FITCH, EDWARD. Review of	
gyrists,	20-35	Wendel's Die Ueberliefer-	
Cato, <i>De Agri Cultura</i> , LVI,			385
A Note on,	67-70		

	PAGE		PAGE
ung der Scholien zu Apollonios von Rhodos,	90-92	KΩΦΟΙ (The) of Sophocles,	167-174
FRANK, TENNEY. An Emendation of <i>octius</i> in Cic. <i>ad Att.</i> 12, 46, 1,	77-78	Lat. <i>nîtêre</i> — <i>renîdêre</i> — <i>nîdor</i> ,	76-77
Further Comment on Suetonius, <i>Nero</i> 33. 1,	175	Lucan in Mediaeval Latin Authors, Quotations from,	1-19
GEEB, RUSSEL M. Suetonius, <i>Augustus</i> , II, 2,	337-339	Lucan, Notes on. Second Group,	49-61
Ghisalberti's Giovanni di Garlandia, rev.,	93-94	Lyonnet's <i>Le parfait en arménien classique</i> , rev.,	371-374
Glotta, Report of,	275-277	MACLAREN, MALCOLM, JR. On the Composition of Xenophon's <i>Hellenica</i> , part I,	121-139
GODOLPHIN, F. R. B. The Unity of Certain Elegies of Propertius,	62-66	—, part II,	249-262
GORDON, A. E. Report of Rivista di Filologia,	176-179	MCCRACKEN, GEORGE. Pindar's Figurative Use of Plants,	340-345
GRAY, LOUIS H. Review of Chantraine's <i>La formation des noms en grec ancien</i> ,	278-280	MCLEAN, JOHN H. The <i>Heraclidae</i> of Euripides,	197-224
Review of Lyonnet's <i>Le parfait en arménien classique</i> ,	371-374	Mediaeval Latin Authors, Quotations from Lucan in,	1-19
HALL, CLAYTON M. Report of Mnemosyne,	84-85	MERITT, BENJAMIN D. Note on the Decrees of Kallias,	263-274
Harry's Greek Tragedy, rev.,	380-382	Review of Nesselhauf's <i>Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der delisch-attischen Symmachie</i> ,	281-287
Hedfors' <i>Compositiones ad Tingenda Musiva</i> , rev.,	192-193	The Expense Account of the Samian War,	365-366
HEIDEL, W. A. A Note on the <i>Agamemnon</i> of Aeschylus,	153-166	MERITT, HERBERT. Old High German Scratched Glosses,	227-235
<i>Hellenica</i> , On the Composition of Xenophon's, part I,	121-139	<i>Metaphysics</i> , Presuppositions of Aristotle's,	36-48
—, part II,	249-262	MEZGER, F. Lat. <i>nîtêre</i> — <i>renîdêre</i> — <i>nîdor</i> ,	76-77
<i>Heraclidae</i> (The) of Euripides,	197-224	MILLER, C. W. E. Editorial Announcement,	196
Homeric Speeches, The Omission of the Vocative in,	140-152	Mnemosyne, Report of,	84-85
HOUGH, JOHN N. The Use of Greek Words by Plautus,	346-364	Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua, IV, rev.,	288-289
Jensen's <i>Ein neuer Brief Epikurs</i> , rev.,	190-191	<i>Nero</i> 33. 1, Further Comment on Suetonius,	175
Kallias, Note on the Decrees of,	263-274	Nesselhauf's <i>Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der delisch-attischen Symmachie</i> , rev.,	281-287
KENT, ROLAND G. Report of Glotta,	275-277	New Light on the History of the Secular Games,	101-120
Review of Walde's <i>Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch</i> ,	290-291	NOCK, ARTHUR DARBY. Review of Kroll's <i>Gott und Hölle</i> ,	182-185
KEYES, CLINTON W. Review of Winter's <i>Life and Letters in the Papyri</i> ,	378-380	Review of Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua, IV,	288-289
Kroll's <i>Gott und Hölle</i> , rev.,	182-185	Note (A) on Cato, <i>De Agri Cultura</i> , LVI,	67-70

- | | PAGE | | PAGE |
|---|------------------|---|---------|
| Note (A) on the <i>Agamemnon</i> | | Quotations from Lucan in Mediaeval Latin Authors, | 1-19 |
| of Aeschylus, | 153-166 | RADFORD, ROBERT S. Review | |
| Note on the Decrees of Kallias, | 263-274 | of Drexler's <i>Plautinische Akzentstudien</i> , | 86-90 |
| Notes on Lucan. Second | | REPORTS: | |
| Group, | 49-61 | Glotta, XXII, 1-2, | 275-277 |
| NUTTING, H. C. Further Comment on Suetonius, <i>Nero</i> | | Mnemosyne LX, 3 and 4, | 84-85 |
| 33.1, | 175 | Philologus LXXXVIII (N. F. XLII) 1933, 1 and 2, | 179-181 |
| Notes on Lucan. Second | | 3 and 4, | 367-370 |
| Group, | 49-61 | Rheinisches Museum | |
| NYKL, A. R. <i>Aljamiado Texts</i> | | LXXIX (1930), | 79-84 |
| (A Rejoinder), | 185-187 | Rivista di Filologia, N. S. | |
| Closing Comment (<i>Aljamiado Texts</i>), | 190 | XI, 1 and 2, | 176-179 |
| OATES, WHITNEY J. A Note on Cato, <i>De Agri Cultura</i> , | | REVIEWS: | |
| LVI, | 67-70 | Chantraine's <i>La formation des noms en grec ancien</i> , | 278-280 |
| Old High German Scratched Glosses, | 227-235 | Clark's <i>The Acts of the Apostles</i> , | 191-192 |
| Omission (The) of the Votive in Homeric Speeches, | 140-152 | Drexler's <i>Plautinische Akzentstudien</i> , | 86-90 |
| On the Composition of Xenophon's <i>Hellenica</i> , part I, | 121-139 | Ghisalberti's <i>Giovanni di Garlandia</i> , | 93-94 |
| —, part II, | 249-262 | Harry's <i>Greek Tragedy</i> , | 380-382 |
| Origin (The) of Pronouns of the First and Second Person, | 244-248 | Hedfors' <i>Compositiones ad Tingenda Musiva</i> , | 192-193 |
| Panegyrist, The Perfect Prince according to the Latin, | 20-35 | Jensen's <i>Ein neuer Brief Epikurs</i> , | 190-191 |
| Perfect (The) Prince according to the Latin Panegyrist, | 20-35 | Kroll's <i>Gott und Hölle</i> , | 182-185 |
| Philologus, Report of, | 179-181, 367-370 | Lyonnet's <i>Le parfait en arménien classique</i> , | 371-374 |
| Pindar's Figurative Use of Plants, | 340-345 | Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua, IV, | 288-289 |
| Plants, Pindar's Figurative Use of, | 340-345 | Nesselhauf's <i>Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der delisch-attischen Symmachie</i> , | 281-287 |
| Plautus, The Use of Greek Words by, | 346-364 | Pólit's <i>Virgilio el Poeta y su Mision Providencial</i> , | 278 |
| Pólit's <i>Virgilio el Poeta y su Mision Providencial</i> , rev., | 278 | Rieth's <i>Grundbegriffe der Stoischen Ethik</i> , | 374-376 |
| Polyeuktos and the <i>Soteria</i> , | 318-336 | Schiaparelli's <i>Note Paleografiche</i> , | 193 |
| POST, L. A. Review of Jensen's <i>Ein neuer Brief Epikurs</i> , | 190-191 | Seltman's <i>Attic Vase-Painting</i> , | 376-377 |
| Review of Clark's <i>The Acts of the Apostles</i> , | 191-192 | Sykturis' <i>Die Briefe des Sokrates und der Sokratiker</i> , | 289-290 |
| Presuppositions of Aristotle's <i>Metaphysics</i> , | 36-48 | Ussani's <i>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</i> , | 95-96 |
| Pronouns of the First and Second Person, The Origin of, | 244-248 | Walde's <i>Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch</i> , | 290-291 |
| Propertius, The Unity of Certain Elegies of, | 62-66 | Wendel's <i>Die Ueberlieferung der Scholien zu Apollonios von Rhodos</i> , | 90-92 |

	PAGE		PAGE
Winter's Life and Letters in the Papyri,	378-380	STRICKLER, ROBERT PARVIN.	
Rheinisches Museum, Report of,	79-84	Report of Rheinisches Museum,	79-84
Rieth's Grundbegriffe der Stoischen Ethik, rev.,	374-376	Suetonius, <i>Augustus</i> , II, 2,	337-339
Rivista di Filologia, Report of,	176-179	Suetonius, <i>Nero</i> 33. 1, Further Comment on,	175
ROBATHAN, DOROTHY M. The Basilica Argentaria,	74-76	Sykutris' Die Briefe des Sokrates und der Sokratiker, rev.,	289-290
Sacrifice of Oxen, Domitian's Intended Edict on,	225-226	SYME, RONALD. The Spanish War of Augustus (26-25 B. C.),	293-317
Samian War, The Expense Account of the,	365-366	TAYLOR, LILY ROSS. New Light on the History of the Secular Games,	101-120
SANFORD, EVA MATTHEWS. Quotations from Lucan in Mediaeval Latin Authors,	1-19	Unity (The) of Certain Elegies of Propertius,	62-66
Schiaparelli's Note Paleografiche, rev.,	193	Use (The) of Greek Words by Plautus,	346-364
SCHLESINGER, ALFRED CARY. Review of Harry's Greek Tragedy,	380-382	Ussani's Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, rev.,	95-96
SCOTT, KENNETH. Domitian's Intended Edict on Sacrifice of Oxen,	225-226	VAN INGEN, WILHELMINA. Review of Seltman's Attic Vase-Painting,	376-377
Review of Weinreich's Menekrates Zeus und Salmoneus,	96-97	VAN SICKLE, C. E. Eumenius and the Schools of Autun,	236-243
Scratched Glosses, Old High German,	227-235	Vocative in Homeric Speeches, The Omission of the,	140-152
Secular Games, New Light on the History of the,	101-120	Walde's Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, rev.,	290-291
Seltman's Attic Vase-Painting, rev.,	376-377	Weinreich's Menekrates Zeus und Salmoneus, rev.,	96-97
Sophocles, The ΚΩΦΟΙ of,	167-174	Wendel's Die Ueberlieferung der Scholien zu Apollonios von Rhodos, rev.,	90-92
Soteria, Polyeyktos and the,	318-336	Winter's Life and Letters in the Papyri, rev.,	378-380
Spanish (The) War of Augustus (26-25 B. C.),	293-317	Xenophon's <i>Hellenica</i> , On the Composition of, part I,	121-139
Strawberry, English,	71-74	—, part II,	249-262

